Product states and Schmidt rank of mutually unbiased bases in dimension six

Lin Chen[1,,2,,*] and Li Yu[3,,†]

[1]School of Mathematics and Systems Science, Beihang University, Beijing 100191, China
[2]International Research Institute for Multidisciplinary Science, Beihang University, Beijing 100191, China
[3]National Institute of Informatics, 2-1-2 Hitotsubashi, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 101-8430, Japan

(Dated: October 18, 2016)

We show that if a set of four mutually unbiased bases (MUBs) in $\mathbb{C}^6$ contains the identity, then any other basis in the set contains at most two product states and at the same time has Schmidt rank at least three. Here the Schmidt rank is defined over the bipartite space $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^3$. We also present a simple argument for why there is at least one vector unbiased to any two given orthonormal bases in any dimension.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Hk, 03.67.-a

arXiv:1610.04875v1 [quant-ph] 16 Oct 2016

Contents

I. Introduction 1

II. Preliminaries 3
A. Schmidt rank and controlled unitary operators 3
B. Unitary equivalence of MUBs 3
C. Linear algebra 4

III. Results 8
A. Complex Hadamard matrices 8
B. MUBs 11
C. The Schmidt rank of matrices in an MUB trio 18
D. Numerical Studies 21

IV. Open problems 21

Acknowledgments 22

References 22

I. INTRODUCTION

Two quantum states in the six-dimensional complex Hilbert space $\mathbb{C}^d$ are mutually unbiased (MU) if the modulus of their inner product is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}$. In this paper we identify a unitary matrix with an orthonormal basis consisting of the column vectors of the matrix. We say that n order-d unitary matrices form n MU bases (MUBs) if the inner product of any two column vectors from different matrices is a complex number of modulus $1/\sqrt{d}$ [1]. An order-d unitary matrix whose elements all have modulus $1/\sqrt{d}$ is a *complex Hadamard matrix (CHM)*. It is known that a triple of MUBs in $\mathbb{C}^6$ have been constructed. It is conjectured that

Conjecture 1. *Four MUBs in $\mathbb{C}^6$ do not exist.*

The MUB has various applications in quantum tomography, cryptography, and the construction of Wigner functions. We refer the readers to recent progress on MUBs in [2–5]. Conjecture 1 is an open problem in quantum physics and quantum information. In this paper we investigate this conjecture in terms of the product vectors and Schmidt rank

*Electronic address: linchen@buaa.edu.cn
†Electronic address: yupapers@sina.com

of matrices introduced in Sec. II. We shall exclude the existence of a few families of CHMs in four MUBs in $\mathbb{C}^6$. Our first result is as follows.

Theorem 2. *If a set of four MUBs in $\mathbb{C}^6$ contains the identity, then*
(i) any other MUB in the set contains at most two product column vectors.
(ii) the other three MUBs in the set contains totally at most six product column vectors.

Assertion (i) is proved by investigating the matrix Y_4 in Lemma 11 (vii), and assertion (ii) follows from (i). We will give the expressions of column product vectors up to local unitaries in (14)-(16). For a few product vectors $|a_1, b_1\rangle, \cdots, , |a_n, b_n\rangle$, the set of them up to local unitaries is defined as the set of product vectors $(U \otimes V)|a_1, b_1\rangle, \cdots, , (U \otimes V)|a_n, b_n\rangle$ for any unitary matrices U and V. It has been proved that any set of seven MUBs in $\mathbb{C}^6$ contains at most one product-vector basis [6]. We refer the readers to the definition of product-vector basis in Sec. II, B. The paper [6] also improves the "seven" to "four" in this assertion, see also Lemma 11 (vi) below. Theorem 2 further restricts the number of product column vectors in a set of four MUBs in $\mathbb{C}^6$. For example, the well-known Fourier matrix F_6 of order six contains six product column vectors, and thus it cannot be a member of any four MUBs containing the identity in $\mathbb{C}^6$. Here

$$F_6 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \alpha & \alpha^2 & \alpha^3 & \alpha^4 & \alpha^5 \\ 1 & \alpha^2 & \alpha^4 & \alpha^6 & \alpha^8 & \alpha^{10} \\ 1 & \alpha^3 & \alpha^6 & \alpha^9 & \alpha^{12} & \alpha^{15} \\ 1 & \alpha^4 & \alpha^8 & \alpha^{12} & \alpha^{16} & \alpha^{20} \\ 1 & \alpha^5 & \alpha^{10} & \alpha^{15} & \alpha^{20} & \alpha^{25} \end{pmatrix} \tag{1}$$

where $\alpha = e^{\frac{\pi i}{3}}$. The subset of a complete set of MUBs is defined as an MU constellation [7]. It is known that an MU constellation consisting of three MUBs plus one additional vector, related to the Heisenberg-Weyl group, does not exist [7]. So the constellation of such type has at most 18 product vectors. In contrast, Theorem 2 (ii) shows that any family of MUB constellation of four MUBs containing the identity matrix has at most 12 product vectors.

We will further show that a set of four MUBs containing the identity matrix cannot also contain a matrix with an order-three submatrix proportional to a unitary, or a real submatrix of size 3×2. This is proved by the matrices Y_1 and Y_6 in Lemma 11 (vii). It excludes the possibility that some known CHMs may be the members of four MUBs containing the identity matrix. They include the Dita matrix [7, Eq. (C.1)], the spectral matrix [7, Eq. (C.4)], and some non-affine CHMs such as the symmetric family [7, Eq. (C.9)].

Next, we introduce our second result.

Theorem 3. *If a set of four MUBs in $\mathbb{C}^6$ contains the identity, then any other MUB in the set has Schmidt rank at least three.*

The notion of Schmidt rank is defined in Sec. II, A, and the proof of the theorem is at the end of Sec. III, C. It excludes the possibility that some known CHMs may be the members of four MUBs containing the identity matrix. They include the Bjorck's circulant matrix in [7, Eq. (C.2)], see Sec. III, C for details. It is known that any 2×3 bipartite unitary operator of Schmidt rank three is a controlled unitary operator [8]. The latter plays an important role in quantum computing and has received extensive research in recent years [8–11]. To understand why the composite dimensions are different from prime dimensions is a main motivation in [2], and our Theorem 3 can be viewed as a step towards the full development of such motivation. In the following we introduce more physical meanings of the Schmidt rank and how they are related to the CHMs.

The Schmidt rank plays an important role in evaluating the following three quantities: entangling power, assisted entangling power and disentangling power of bipartite unitaries [8–11]. The first two quantities quantitatively characterize the maximum amount of entanglement increase when the input states are respectively a product state and an arbitrary pure state. The third quantity describes the maximum amount of entanglement decrease over all pure input states. The maximum amount of entanglement increase over all input states is a lower bound of the entanglement cost for implementing bipartite unitaries under local operations and classical communication (LOCC). Since a CHM in composite dimension can be viewed as a special bipartite unitary operator, we hope the introduction of the Schmidt rank could further the study of CHMs, and that in turn would help the study of MUBs.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we introduce in Definition 4 the notations used in the paper, such as the Schmidt rank of bipartite unitary operators, equivalent MUBs, the MUB trio and some results from linear algebra. We further construct the preliminary results in Lemma 5 and 6. In Sec. III we construct results for order-six MUBs and complex Hadamard matrices in Lemma 7. We present a simple argument for why there is at least one vector unbiased to any two given orthonormal bases in any dimension in Lemma 8. We shall exclude the existence of several types of order-six CHM as a member of some MUB trio in Lemma 11. Using them we construct Lemma 12 as a preliminary result for Theorem 2, 3 and Corollary 13. We also carry out a few numerical studies about some CHMs such as that in Proposition 14. We propose a few problems in Sec. IV.

II. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we introduce the notations and preliminary results used in the paper. They include the Schmidt rank of bipartite unitary operators and controlled unitary operators in Sec. II, A, unitary equivalence and local equivalence of MUBs in Definition 4 in Sec. II, B, and linear algebra in Lemmas 5 and 6 in Sec. II, C. In particular, Lemma 6 consists of results on the product states, matrix rank, permutation matrices, contraction, and so on. While useful for the current topic of MUBs, these results may have broader applications in quantum information, such as the separable and positive-partial-transpose (PPT) states.

A. Schmidt rank and controlled unitary operators

We denote $|i,j\rangle, i=1,\cdots,,d_A,\ j=1,\cdots,,d_B$ as the computational-basis states of the bipartite Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}=\mathcal{H}_A\otimes\mathcal{H}_B=\mathbb{C}^{d_A}\otimes\mathbb{C}^{d_B}$. Let I_A, I_B and I_k be the identity operators on the spaces $\mathcal{H}_A$, $\mathcal{H}_B$ and the identity matrix of order d, respectively. The bipartite unitary gate U acting on $\mathcal{H}$ has *Schmidt rank* n if there is an expansion $U=\sum_{j=1}^{n}A_j\otimes B_j$ where the $d_A\times d_A$ matrices $A_1,\cdots,,A_n$ are linearly independent, and the $d_B\times d_B$ matrices $B_1,\cdots,,B_n$ are also linearly independent. The expansion is called the *Schmidt decomposition*. The Schmidt rank is equivalent to the notion of operator-Schmidt rank in [12, 13].

We say that U is a *controlled unitary gate*, if U is equivalent to $\sum_{j=1}^{d_A}|j\rangle\langle j|\otimes U_j$ or $\sum_{j=1}^{d_B}V_j\otimes|j\rangle\langle j|$ via local unitaries. Further, U is controlled in the computational basis from A side if $U=\sum_{j=1}^{d_A}|j\rangle\langle j|\otimes U_j$. Bipartite unitary gates of Schmidt rank two or three are in fact controlled unitaries [8–10]. We shall denote $V\oplus W$ as the ordinary direct sum of two matrices V and W, and $V\oplus_B W$ as the direct sum of V and W from the B side (called "B-direct sum"). In the latter case, V and W respectively act on two subspaces $\mathcal{H}_A\otimes\mathcal{H}'_B$ and $\mathcal{H}_A\otimes\mathcal{H}''_B$ such that $\mathcal{H}'_B\perp\mathcal{H}''_B$. A permutation matrix (or equivalently a permutation unitary) is a unitary matrix containing elements 0 and 1 only. A complex permutation matrix is a unitary matrix with one and only one nonzero element in each row and column.

B. Unitary equivalence of MUBs

To investigate Conjecture 1 we review the following definitions. As mentioned previously, an order-d unitary matrix whose entries all have modulus $1/\sqrt{d}$ is called a complex Hadamard matrix (CHM). When $d=pq$ where $p,q>1$, we call a basis of $\mathbb{C}^d$ consisting of product vectors in $\mathbb{C}^p\otimes\mathbb{C}^q$ as a product-vector basis. We call a square matrix as a product-vector matrix when its columns form a product-vector basis. We say that n unitary matrices form n product-vector MUBs when these matrices are all product-vector matrices and they form n MUBs. For a square matrix C, we say C is a direct-product matrix if $C=F\otimes G$ where F and G are square matrices of order greater than one (in this paper the orders of F and G are fixed when we use such definition). Our definition of product-vector basis corresponds to both the direct product basis and the indirect product basis in [14]. We refer to the *subunitary matrix* as the matrix proportional to a unitary matrix. The H_2-reducible CHM is an order-six CHM that contains a subunitary submatrix of order two [15]. Now we present the following definitions.

Definition 4. *(i) Let $U_1,\cdots,,U_n$ be n unitary matrices of order d. They form n MUBs if and only if for an arbitrary unitary matrix X, and arbitrary complex permutation matrices $P_1,\cdots,,P_n$, the n matrices $XU_1P_1,\cdots,,XU_nP_n$ form n MUBs. In this case we say that $U_1,\cdots,,U_n$ and $XU_1P_1,\cdots,,XU_nP_n$ are* ***unitarily equivalent*** *MUBs. Furthermore they are* ***locally unitarily (LU) equivalent*** *MUBs when X is a direct-product matrix.*

Let $U_1,\cdots,,U_n$ be product-vector MUBs such that $U_j=(\cdots,,|a_{jk},b_{jk}\rangle,\cdots,)$ where $|a_{jk}\rangle\in\mathbb{C}^p$ and $|b_{jk}\rangle\in\mathbb{C}^q$. Let $U_j^{\Gamma_A}$ and $U_j^{\Gamma_B}$ both denote U_j except that $|a_j\rangle$ and $|b_j\rangle$ are respectively replaced by their complex conjugates. Then we say that any two of the following four sets

$$U_1,\cdots,,U_n, \tag{2}$$
$$U_1^{\Gamma_A},\cdots,,U_n^{\Gamma_A}, \tag{3}$$
$$U_1^{\Gamma_B},\cdots,,U_n^{\Gamma_B}, \tag{4}$$
$$XU_1P_1,\cdots,,XU_nP_n, \tag{5}$$

are LU-equivalent product-vector MUBs, where X is a direct-product matrix.
(ii) Let U,V and W be three CHMs of order six. Conjecture 1 is equivalent to ask whether I,U,V and W can form four MUBs, i.e., whether $U^\dagger V$, $V^\dagger W$ and $W^\dagger U$ are still CHMs. If they do, then we denote the set of U,V and W as an MUB trio.

(iii) We say that two CHMs X and Y are ***equivalent*** *when there exist two complex permutation matrices C and D such that $X = CYD$. For simplicity we refer to X as Y up to equivalence. The equivalence class of X is the set of all CHMs which are equivalent to X. The minimum Schmidt rank in the equivalence class of X is called the* min-Schmidt rank *of X.*
(iv) In (iii), we say that X and Y are ***locally equivalent*** *when C is a direct-product matrix.*

We say that an order-n CHM is in the *dephased form* when all elements in the first row and first column of the CHM are equal to $1/\sqrt{n}$. Evidently every CHM is equivalent to another CHM in the dephased form.

The CHMs in $\mathbb{C}^6$ have been extensively introduced in the appendix A of [3]. In particular, it has been shown that the pair $\{I, S\}$ cannot be extended to a triple of MUBs [3]. Here I is the identity matrix, and S is a CHM known as the *spectral matrix* [16]

$$S = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & \omega & \omega & \omega^2 & \omega^2 \\ 1 & \omega & 1 & \omega^2 & \omega^2 & \omega \\ 1 & \omega & \omega^2 & 1 & \omega & \omega^2 \\ 1 & \omega^2 & \omega^2 & \omega & 1 & \omega \\ 1 & \omega^2 & \omega & \omega^2 & \omega & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{6}$$

where $\omega := e^{2\pi i/3}$. From now on we regard any order-six CHM as a 2×3 bipartite unitary. One may easily check that S has Schmidt rank four. The general CHM U has Schmidt at most four and we exemplify the U's with arbitrary Schmidt rank. First, $U = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \omega & \omega^2 \\ 1 & \omega^2 & \omega \end{pmatrix}$ has Schmidt rank one. Next, $U = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} V & W \\ V & -W \end{pmatrix}$ has Schmidt rank two when V and W are two CHMs of order three. Another Schmidt-rank-two CHM is the so-called Bjorcks circulant matrix, see [3, Eq. (A2)]. It has the expression $\begin{pmatrix} X & Y \\ Y & X \end{pmatrix}$, and neither of the order-three matrices X and Y is proportional to a unitary matrix. Third,

$$U = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{diag}(-i, i, 1) \cdot V & V \\ V & \mathrm{diag}(-i, i, -1) \cdot V \end{pmatrix} \tag{7}$$

is a CHM of Schmidt rank three, where V is a CHM of order three. U may also be of Schmidt rank four, e.g., the spectral matrix in (6). For any Schmidt-rank four U, we may assume that

$$U = \sum_{j,k=1}^{2} |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes U_{jk} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k=1}^{2} (\sqrt{2}|j\rangle\langle k|) \otimes (\sqrt{2}U_{jk}). \tag{8}$$

One may check that $\{(\sqrt{2}|j\rangle\langle k|\}$ and $\{\sqrt{2}U_{jk}\}$ are two basis, and the former is orthonormal. One may easily extend the above examples to $2 \times d_B$ CHMs U of Schmidt rank two, three and four. We construct an example of Schmidt-rank-four. Let

$$U = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} D \cdot V & D \cdot W \\ V & -W \end{pmatrix} \tag{9}$$

where D, V, W are all order-d_B CHMs, D is a diagonal unitary and not proportional to the identity matrix, V, W are linearly independent and $WV^\dagger$ is not diagonal. Then one can show that U is a Schmidt-rank-four $2 \times d_B$ CHM.

C. Linear algebra

For studying Conjecture 1, we propose a few preliminary facts on linear algebra in Lemma 6. First of all we introduce a result from [11, Lemma 1] about diagonal unitary matrices. In this paper we will apply it to vectors, since the set of diagonal unitary matrices of order d is isomorphic to the set of d-dimensional column vectors with elements of modulus $1/\sqrt{d}$.

Lemma 5. *Let D be a diagonal unitary matrix. The following four statements are equivalent.*
(i) D has at least three distinct eigenvalues;
(ii) the identity, D and $D^\dagger$ are linearly independent;
(iii) any unitary in the linear span of the identity and D is proportional to one of them;
(iv) any multiple of unitary in the linear span of the identity and D is proportional to one of them. □

For further investigation, we introduce a few definitions. The *generalized permutation matrix (GPM)* is a square matrix such that there is exactly one nonzero entry in each row and each column of the matrix. For example the complex permutation matrix is a GPM. A *contraction* is a matrix A such that

$$\langle x|A^\dagger A|x\rangle \leq 1 \tag{10}$$

for any normalized pure state $|x\rangle$. We shall also refer to the *doubly quasistochastic matrices* as the matrices whose every row's and column's elements sum to one [17, Definition 5.11]. Such matrices reduce to the doubly stochastic matrices when they are square matrices and of all nonnegative elements. We further denote ρ^Γ as the partial transpose w.r.t. the first system of the bipartite state ρ, and ρ is PPT when $\rho^\Gamma \geq 0$.

Lemma 6. *(i) Suppose $1 + e^{i\alpha} + e^{i\beta} = 0$, where $\alpha, \beta \in [0, 2\pi)$. Then $(\alpha, \beta) = (\frac{2}{3}\pi, \frac{4}{3}\pi)$ or $(\frac{4}{3}\pi, \frac{2}{3}\pi)$.*
(ii) Suppose $[u_{jk}]$ is an order-three unitary matrix of at most one zero entry, and $[p_{jk}u_{jk}]$ is also an unitary matrix where $p_{11} = p_{12} = p_{13} = p_{21} = p_{31} = 1$, and $p_{jk} = \pm 1$ otherwise. Then $[p_{jk}u_{jk}] = D_1[u_{jk}]D_2$ where D_1 and D_2 are diagonal real unitary matrices.
(iii) If an orthonormal basis in $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^3$ contains five product states, then the remaining state of the basis is also a product state.
(iv) Suppose $e^{ia} + e^{ib} = e^{ic} + e^{id}$ where $a, b, c, d \in [0, 2\pi)$. Then we have either of the three cases: $a = c, b = d$, or $a = d, b = c$, or $|a - b| = |c - d| = \pi$.
(v) Suppose $\begin{pmatrix} V_0 & V_1 \\ V_2 & V_3 \end{pmatrix}$ is a partitioned unitary matrix of order d. Then V_0 and V_3 have full rank at the same time. Furthermore if V_0 and V_3 are both square matrices, then $\mathrm{rank}V_0 + \mathrm{rank}V_3 \leq d - 2\dim\ker V_0$.
(vi) A unitary matrix of order d without any zero element cannot have a singular submatrix of order $d - 1$. In particular, any CHM of order 6 does not have a singular submatrix of order 5.
(vii) Any Schmidt-rank-three 2×3 unitary operator is the product of two Schmidt-rank-two 2×3 unitary operators.
(viii) Let $(1, 1, 1)$ and $(1, e^{i\alpha}, e^{i\beta})$ be two linearly independent vectors orthogonal to the nonzero vector $(w, xe^{i\gamma}, ye^{i\delta})$, where $w, x, y \geq 0$ and $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in [0, 2\pi)$. Then

1. *If $\alpha = 0$ then $w = x$, $y = 0$ and $\gamma = \pi$.*
2. *If $\beta = 0$ then $w = y$, $x = 0$ and $\delta = \pi$.*
3. *If $\alpha = \beta$ then $x = y$, $w = 0$ and $|\gamma - \delta| = \pi$.*
4. *If $\alpha\beta \neq 0$ and $\alpha \neq \beta$ then*

$$\gamma = \frac{\alpha}{2}, \quad \delta = \frac{\beta}{2} + \pi, \quad x = \frac{\sin\frac{\beta}{2}}{\sin(\frac{\alpha}{2} - \frac{\beta}{2})}w, \quad y = \frac{\sin\frac{\alpha}{2}}{\sin(\frac{\alpha}{2} - \frac{\beta}{2})}w, \tag{11}$$

or

$$\gamma = \frac{\alpha}{2} + \pi, \quad \delta = \frac{\beta}{2}, \quad x = -\frac{\sin\frac{\beta}{2}}{\sin(\frac{\alpha}{2} - \frac{\beta}{2})}w, \quad y = -\frac{\sin\frac{\alpha}{2}}{\sin(\frac{\alpha}{2} - \frac{\beta}{2})}w. \tag{12}$$

(ix) Suppose $a + b = ax + by = 1$ where a, b are real and $|x| = |y| = 1$. Then we have $a = 0, b = y = 1$, or $b = 0, a = x = 1$, or $x = y = 1$.
(x) Any order-three unitary matrix containing a zero entry can be written as

$$P \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \cos\epsilon & -\sin\epsilon \\ \cos\delta & \sin\delta\sin\epsilon & \sin\delta\cos\epsilon \\ \sin\delta & -\cos\delta\sin\epsilon & -\cos\delta\cos\epsilon \end{pmatrix} \cdot Q \tag{13}$$

where $\delta, \epsilon \in [0, \pi/2]$, P and Q are complex permutation matrices.
(xi) Let $\cos^2\alpha\cos^2\beta + \sin^2\alpha\sin^2\beta = 1/2$ and $\alpha, \beta \in [0, \pi/2]$. Then $\alpha = \pi/4$ or $\beta = \pi/4$.
(xii) Let u, v, s, t be complex numbers of modulus one. Then $(u + v)(s^* + t^*)(u^*s + v^*t)$ is real.
(xiii) Let u, v, s be complex numbers of modulus one. If $uv + us + v - s = 0$, then $(u, v) = (-i, is)$ or $(i, -is)$.
(xiv) For any unitary matrix U, there are diagonal unitaries L and R such that LUR is doubly quasistochastic. Neither L or R are necessarily unique.
(xv) Any submatrix of a unitary matrix is a contraction.
(xvi) Suppose T is a square matrix whose row vectors are normalized. Then T is a contraction if and only if T is unitary.

(xvii) Suppose V is an invertible order-two matrix whose row vectors are orthogonal and whose column vectors are also orthogonal. Then V is a GPM or a subunitary matrix containing no zero elements.

(xviii) Suppose V is an invertible order-three matrix whose row vectors are pairwise orthogonal and whose column vectors are also pairwise orthogonal. Then V is a GPM, or the direct sum of a complex number and an order-two subunitary matrix containing no zero elements up to row and column permutations, or a subunitary matrix containing at most one zero element.

(xix) For any positive definite matrix W, there are diagonal matrices L and R such that LWR is doubly quasistochastic. Neither L or R are necessarily unique.

(xx) Suppose an orthonormal basis in $\mathbb{C}^6$ contains k product states. Then the remaining $6-k$ states in the basis span a subspace spanned by orthogonal product vectors.

(xxi) The set of orthonormal product states in $\mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^3$ is LU equivalent to one of the following three sets,

$$\mathcal{P}_1 := \{|0,0\rangle, |0,1\rangle, |0,2\rangle, |1,a_0\rangle, |1,a_1\rangle, |1,a_2\rangle\}; \tag{14}$$

$$\mathcal{P}_2 := \{|0,0\rangle, |0,1\rangle, |1,b_0\rangle, |1,b_1\rangle, |c_0,2\rangle, |c_1,2\rangle\}; \tag{15}$$

$$\mathcal{P}_3 := \{|0,0\rangle, |1,0\rangle, |d_0,1\rangle, |d_1,1\rangle, |e_0,2\rangle, |e_1,2\rangle\}. \tag{16}$$

Here $\{|a_i\rangle\}$ is an orthonormal basis in $\mathbb{C}^3$, $\{|b_i\rangle\}$, $\{|c_i\rangle\}$, $\{|d_i\rangle\}$ and $\{|e_i\rangle\}$ are all orthonormal bases in the 2-dimensional space spanned by $|0\rangle, |1\rangle$.

(xxii) Let $|a|^2 + |b|^2 = 1$, $|v\rangle$, $|w\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^3$, and $a|v\rangle + b|w\rangle$ be of elements of modulus $1/\sqrt{3}$. Then $ab = 0$ or $[|v\rangle, |w\rangle]$ is a matrix of size 3×2 equivalent to a real matrix.

Proof. (i) can be proved straightforwardly.

(ii) Since $[u_{jk}]$ and $[p_{jk}u_{jk}]$ are both unitary we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{3} u_{1j}^* u_{2j} = \sum_{j=1}^{3} p_{2j} u_{1j}^* u_{2j} = 0. \tag{17}$$

Since $p_{21} = p_{31} = 1$, if $[u_{jk}]$ contains no zero then $p_{jk} = 1$ for all j, k. So the assertion holds. Suppose $[u_{jk}]$ contains exactly one zero entry. Eq. (17) implies that $p_{22} = p_{23}$. We can similarly prove that $p_{32} = p_{33}$, and construct D_1 and D_2.

(iii) Suppose $\{|\psi_j\rangle\}_{j=1,\cdots,,6}$ is the basis and $|\psi_j\rangle = |a_j, b_j\rangle$ for $j = 1, \cdots, , 5$. Since $\sum_{j=1}^{6} |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j| = I_6$, we have

$$|\psi_6\rangle\langle\psi_6| = I_6 - \sum_{j=1}^{5} |a_j, b_j\rangle\langle a_j, b_j|. \tag{18}$$

We perform the partial transpose on both sides of the above equation, and both sides are still positive semidefinite matrices. It holds only if $|\psi_6\rangle$ is a product state.

(iv) Since $e^{ia} + e^{ib} = e^{ic} + e^{id}$, we have $\cos a + \cos b = \cos c + \cos d$ and $\sin a + \sin b = \sin c + \sin d$. By squaring both sides and summing up them, we obtain

$$\cos(a-b) = \cos(c-d), \tag{19}$$

$$\cos(a-c) = \cos(b-d), \tag{20}$$

$$\cos(a-d) = \cos(b-c). \tag{21}$$

Straightforwardly solving the equations lead to the assertion.

(v) It suffices to prove that claim that if V_0 is singular then so is V_3. Suppose V_0 and V_3 are respectively of size $m \times n$ and $(d-m) \times (d-n)$. Suppose V_0 has rank $r < n$. Let W be an order-m unitary matrix such that the first $m-r$ row vectors of WV_0 is zero. Since $(W \oplus I_{d-m})U = \begin{pmatrix} WV_0 & WV_1 \\ V_2 & V_3 \end{pmatrix}$ is unitary, the first $m-r$ row vectors of $(W \oplus I_{d-m})U$ are orthogonal to the row vectors of $\begin{pmatrix} V_2 & V_3 \end{pmatrix}$. Hence the first $m-r$ row vectors of WV_1, which are pairwise orthogonal vectors, are orthogonal to the row vectors of V_3. Since $(d-m) + (m-r) > d-n$, we obtain that the row vectors of V_3 are linearly dependent. So V_3 is singular.

To prove the second claim, we assume that V_0 has order m and rank r. Then

$$\mathrm{rank}V_0 + \mathrm{rank}V_3 \leq r + (d-m) - (m-r) = d - 2m + 2r = d - 2\dim\ker V_0. \tag{22}$$

(vi) The assertion follows from (v) by letting the order of V_0 be $m = d-1$ in the last assertion of (v), and noting that $\dim\ker V_0 \geq 1$ and $\mathrm{rank}V_3 \geq 1$, and that the equation $\mathrm{rank}V_0 + \dim\ker V_0 = m$ holds by definition of the rank.

(vii) Suppose U is a Schmidt-rank-three 2×3 unitary operator. It is known that U is a controlled unitary from the B side [8]. We can write $U=(W\otimes X)\cdot(\sum_{j=1}^{3}V_j\otimes P_j)\cdot(Y\otimes Z)$ where $V_1=I_2$, P_1,P_2,P_3 are pairwise orthogonal projectors, W,Y are local unitaries on $\mathcal{H}_A$, and X,Z are local unitaries on $\mathcal{H}_B$. Hence $U=QR$ where

$$Q=(W\otimes X)\cdot[I_2\otimes(P_1+P_2)+V_3\otimes P_3], \tag{23}$$

$$R=[I_2\otimes(P_1+P_3)+V_2\otimes P_2]\cdot(Y\otimes Z), \tag{24}$$

are both Schmidt-rank-two 2×3 unitary operators.

(viii) Case 1, 2 and 3 can be verified straightforwardly. It suffices to prove case 4. Suppose $\alpha\beta\neq 0$ and $\alpha\neq\beta$. The conditions imply two equations

$$w+xe^{i\gamma}+ye^{i\delta}=w+xe^{i(\gamma-\alpha)}+ye^{i(\delta-\beta)}=0. \tag{25}$$

They further imply $|w+xe^{i\gamma}|=|w+xe^{i(\gamma-\alpha)}|$, and $|w+ye^{i\delta}|=|w+ye^{i(\delta-\beta)}|$. We obtain $\cos\gamma=\cos(\gamma-\alpha)$ and $\cos\delta=\cos(\delta-\beta)$. Hence we have two equations $2m\pi\pm\gamma=\gamma-\alpha$ and $2n\pi\pm\delta=\delta-\beta$ for some integers m,n. They hold only for the positive signs because $\alpha\beta\neq 0$. Hence $m,n\in\{0,1\}$ because $\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta\in[0,2\pi)$. Using them in (25) we have $w+(-1)^m xe^{i\alpha/2}+(-1)^n ye^{i\beta/2}=0$. It implies that

$$w+(-1)^m x\cos(\alpha/2)+(-1)^n y\cos(\beta/2)=0, \tag{26}$$

$$(-1)^m x\sin(\alpha/2)+(-1)^n y\sin(\beta/2)=0. \tag{27}$$

Eq. (25) shows that $w,x,y>0$. The same equation implies that $(m,n)=(0,1)$ or $(1,0)$. They respectively imply (11) and (12) by using (26) and (27).

(ix) Let $x=e^{i\alpha}$ and $y=e^{i\beta}$ with real α and β. The condition $ax+by=1$ implies that $a^2+b^2+2ab\cos(\alpha-\beta)=1$. Together with the condition $a+b=1$, we obtain that $ab[\cos(\alpha-\beta)-1]=0$.

(x) It suffices to prove the assertion for the order-three unitary matrix U whose first element is zero. One can show that U can be written as

$$U=\begin{pmatrix} 0 & e^{i\zeta}\cos\epsilon & -e^{i(\lambda+\eta)}\sin\epsilon \\ e^{i\beta}\cos\delta & e^{i(\beta+\alpha)}\sin\delta\sin\epsilon & e^{i(\beta+\eta)}\sin\delta\cos\epsilon \\ e^{i\gamma}\sin\delta & -e^{i(\gamma+\alpha)}\cos\delta\sin\epsilon & -e^{i(\gamma+\eta)}\cos\delta\cos\epsilon \end{pmatrix}, \tag{28}$$

where $\alpha,\cdots,,\lambda$ are all real parameters and $\delta,\epsilon\in[0,\pi/2]$. The orthogonality of the second and third column vectors in U implies $e^{i\zeta}=e^{i(\lambda+\alpha)}$. So the assertion holds.

(xi) The equation $\cos^2\alpha\cos^2\beta+\sin^2\alpha\sin^2\beta=1/2$ is equivalent to $\cos 2\alpha\cos 2\beta=0$. So the assertion holds.

(xii) The assertion can be proved straightforwardly.

(xiii) The assertion follows from (iv).

(xiv) The assertion follows from the Sinkhorn normal form of unitary matrices [17, Theorem 5.13].

(xv) We prove the assertion when the submatrix is a square matrix, and the assertion for non-square submatrices is a corollary. The proof is simply by extending the proof of [18, Lemma 2.16] to any unitary matrix of any order from complex Hadamard matrices of order 6. Note that the definition of complex Hadamard matrix in [18] differs from ours by a factor $\sqrt{d}$, where d is the order of the matrix.

(xvi) The "if" part follows from (xv). We prove the "only if" part. Denote the first row of T as $\langle w|$. Let $|v\rangle=\langle w|^\dagger$, then the first element of $T|v\rangle$ is 1. Since T is a contraction, $\langle v|T^\dagger T|v\rangle\leq 1$, thus the other elements of $T|v\rangle$ must be zero. This means that all rows of T except the first row are orthogonal to the first row. Similarly, any two different rows of T are mutually orthogonal. Thus T is unitary.

(xvii) The assertion straightforwardly from computation.

(xviii) First, suppose the matrix V contains two zero elements. Using (xvii), one can easily show that V is one of the first two cases in the assertion. Next, suppose V contains exactly one zero element. Up to permutation of row and columns of V, we may assume that the first entry of V is zero. The hypothesis implies that the first column vector of V is orthogonal to the remaining two column vectors, and the first row vector is orthogonal to the remaining two row vectors. We have $V=\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -d^*e & c^*e \\ a & b^*c & b^*d \\ b & -a^*c & -a^*d \end{pmatrix}$ for some nonzero complex numbers a,b,c,d,e. The orthogonality between the second and third column vectors of V, and between the second and third row vectors of V imply that $|e|^2=|a|^2+|b|^2$ and $1=|c|^2+|d|^2$. Hence the norm of the row vectors and column vectors are all equal to $|e|$. So V is a subunitary. Third, suppose V contains no zero element. The hypothesis implies that $VV^\dagger=D_1$ and $V^\dagger V=D_2$ where both D_1,D_2 are positive definite matrices. Their diagonal elements are the squares of the singular values of V. Hence there is a permutation matrix P such that $PD_1P^\dagger=D_2$. Using [10, Lemma 1 (i)] that we may assume that

$$V=D_1^{1/2}U=WD_2^{1/2}. \tag{29}$$

Using the above equations and [10, Lemma 1 (iv)], we obtain $U = W$. Since V has no zero element, neither does W. The last two facts together with the last equality in Eq. (29) imply that D_1 and D_2 are both proportional to the identity matrix. So V is a subunitary.

(xix) The assertion follows from the Sinkhorn normal form of positive definite matrices [17, Theorem 5.12].

(xx) Let $|a_1, b_1\rangle, \cdots, , |a_k, b_k\rangle$ be the k product states of the orthonormal basis in the hypothesis. Let $|c_{k+1}\rangle, \cdots, , |c_6\rangle$ be the remaining vectors in the basis. Hence $\rho := \sum_{j=k+1}^{6} |c_j\rangle\langle c_j| = I_6 - \sum_{j=1}^{k} |a_i, b_i\rangle\langle a_i, b_i|$. Since $|a_j, b_j\rangle$ are orthonormal, ρ is a non-normalized positive partial transpose (PPT) state. The Horodecki-Peres criterion implies that ρ is a non-normalized 2×3 separable state and $\text{rank}\rho = \text{rank}\rho^{\Gamma} = 6 - k$. It follows from [19, Table II] that $\rho = \sum_{j=k+1}^{6} |e_j, f_j\rangle\langle e_j, f_j|$ with some product vectors $|e_j, f_j\rangle$. Since ρ is proportional to a projector, $|e_j, f_j\rangle$ are pairwise orthogonal.

(xxi) The assertion follows from the paragraph below [20, Proposition 3].

(xxii) The assertion holds if it holds when $|v\rangle$ and $|w\rangle$ are respectively replaced by $P|v\rangle$ and $P|w\rangle$ with any complex permutation matrix P. So we may assume that $|v\rangle = (1, 1, 1)/\sqrt{3}$ and $|w\rangle = (1, x, y)/\sqrt{3}$ with $|x| = |y| = 1$. The hypothesis says that $a|v\rangle + b|w\rangle$ has elements of modulus $1/\sqrt{3}$. If 1, x and y are distinct then Lemma 5 implies that $ab = 0$. If two of them are the same, then the hypothesis and $|a|^2 + |b|^2 = 1$ imply that $ab = 0$, or $x, y \in \{1, -1\}$.

This completes the proof. ■

Note that the proof for the third case of (xviii) indeed holds for arbitrary square matrix containing no zero element. Besides, one of the diagonal matrices L and R in (xix) may be not unitary. An example is $W = \text{diag}(2, 1)$. Whether one of L and R can be chosen as a unitary matrix for any W is unknown.

III. RESULTS

In this section we introduce our main results. In Sec. III, A we investigate the order-six CHMs in terms of the subunitary matrices in Lemma 7. In Sec. III, B we present a simple argument for why there is at least one vector unbiased to any two given orthonormal bases in any dimension in Lemma 8. We discuss the number of such vectors in Conjecture 9 and Lemma 10. We further construct a few preliminary results on MUBs in Lemma 11. They show that some CHMs do not exist in four MUBs containing the identity matrix. In Sec. III, C we show that the member of any MUB trio has Schmidt rank at least three in Theorem 3. This is based on the preliminary Lemma 12. We also show in Corollary 13 that if a set of four MUBs in $\mathbb{C}^6$ contains the identity, then any other MUB in the set has min-Schmidt rank at least three. In Sec. III, D we carry out a few numerical studies about the unbiased vectors, the Schmidt rank, and the submatrices of some CHMs such as that in Proposition 14.

A. Complex Hadamard matrices

In the following lemma we provide a few properties of the order-six CHMs. For example, we show in (iii) that such CHMs do not contain any rank-one order-three submatrix, any order-four submatrix of rank at most two, and any singular order-five submatrix. We further find out the relations of elements of H_2-reducible CHMs in (vi) and (vii).

Lemma 7. *(i) Every order-three CHM can be written as $D_1 V D_2$ where D_1 and D_2 are both diagonal unitaries, and $V = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \omega & \omega^2 \\ 1 & \omega^2 & \omega \end{pmatrix}$ or $\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \omega^2 & \omega \\ 1 & \omega & \omega^2 \end{pmatrix}$.*
(ii) If an order-six CHM has a submatrix of size $2 \times k$ and rank one, then $k \leq 3$ and the equality is achievable.
(iii) The order-six CHM does not have any rank-one order-three submatrix, any order-four submatrix of rank at most two, and any singular order-five submatrix.
(iv) The order-six CHM is an H_2-reducible CHM if and only if the CHM is equivalent to another CHM containing two product column vectors $|a, b\rangle, |a^{\perp}, c\rangle$ where $|a\rangle, |a^{\perp}\rangle$ is an orthonormal basis in $\mathbb{C}^2$.
(v) The order-six CHM has a submatrix of size 3×2 with orthogonal column vectors if and only if the CHM is equivalent to another CHM containing two product column vectors $|a, b\rangle, |c, b^{\perp}\rangle$ where $|b\rangle, |b^{\perp}\rangle$ is an orthonormal basis in $\mathbb{C}^3$.

(vi) The H_2-reducible CHM is equivalent to the CHM H in [15, Theorem 11]. We express it as

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & z_1 & -z_1 & z_2 & -z_2 \\ 1 & z_3 & a_1 & a_2 & b_1 & b_2 \\ 1 & -z_3 & a_1a_3 & -a_2a_3 & b_1b_3 & -b_2b_3 \\ 1 & z_4 & c_1 & c_2 & d_1 & d_2 \\ 1 & -z_4 & c_1c_3 & -c_2c_3 & d_1d_3 & -d_2d_3 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{30}$$

where z_j, a_j, b_j, c_j, and d_j are complex numbers of modulus one and satisfy the conditions in [15, Theorem 11] and

$$\begin{aligned} z_1z_3 &= a_1a_2a_3, && (31)\\ z_2z_3 &= b_1b_2b_3, && (32)\\ z_1z_4 &= c_1c_2c_3, && (33)\\ z_2z_4 &= d_1d_2d_3, && (34)\\ a_1+a_2+z_1z_3(a_2^*-a_1^*) &= d_1+d_2+z_2z_4(d_2^*-d_1^*), && (35)\\ z_3^*(a_1+a_2-z_1z_3(a_2^*-a_1^*)) &= z_4^*(d_1+d_2-z_2z_4(d_2^*-d_1^*)), && (36)\\ b_1+b_2+z_2z_3(b_2^*-b_1^*) &= c_1+c_2+z_1z_4(c_2^*-c_1^*), && (37)\\ z_3^*(b_1+b_2-z_2z_3(b_2^*-b_1^*)) &= z_4^*(c_1+c_2-z_1z_4(c_2^*-c_1^*)). && (38) \end{aligned}$$

Further
(vi.a) If one of the elements in the lower right order-four submatrix of (30) *is equal to a constant, then up to equivalence we may assume that a_1 is the constant.*
(vi.b) Consider two matrices in (30) *with $z_3=-b_1$ and $z_3=-b_2$, respectively. Then they are equivalent up to the exchange of the last two columns of* (30)*.*
(vii) If $\begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} & A_{13} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} & A_{23} \\ A_{31} & A_{32} & A_{33} \end{pmatrix}$ *is an order-six CHM and the A_{ij} are order-two square matrices, and $A_{11}, A_{12}, A_{13}, A_{21}, A_{31}$ are subunitary matrices, then the remaining A_{ij} are also subunitary matrices.*
(viii) No order-six CHM contains the following submatrix of size 3×4

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & x & x^* \\ 1 & w & y & z \end{pmatrix}, \tag{39}$$

where w, x, z are complex numbers of modulus one and $(1+w^*)(1-x^*)(y-xz)\notin\mathbb{R}$.
(ix) Any order-six CHM can be written as

$$\begin{pmatrix} V_1 & 0 \\ 0 & W_1 \end{pmatrix}\cdot\begin{pmatrix} D_1 & D_2 \\ D_2 & -D_1 \end{pmatrix}\cdot\begin{pmatrix} V_2 & 0 \\ 0 & W_2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{40}$$

where V_1, V_2, W_1, W_2 are order-three unitary matrices, D_1, D_2 are diagonal matrices of real and nonnegative elements. Further $\mathrm{Tr}\ D_j^2 = 3/2$ *and* $\mathrm{rank}\ D_j \geq 2$ *for any j.*
(x) The spectral matrix in (6) *is equivalent to a CHM of Schmidt rank three with its upper left order-three submatrix being a subunitary matrix, while the upper left and bottom right order-three submatrices are equal.*

Proof. (i) follows from Lemma 6 (i).

(ii) Up to the equivalence, we may assume that the upper left submatrix of size $2\times k$ of the order-six CHM $U=[a_{ij}]_{i,j=1,\cdots,6}$ has rank one. Since $\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_{i1}a_{i2}^* = -\sum_{i=k+1}^{6} a_{i1}a_{i2}^*$ and $|a_{ij}|=1/\sqrt{6}$, we have

$$|\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_{i1}a_{i2}^*| = k/6 = |\sum_{i=k+1}^{6} a_{i1}a_{i2}^*| \leq (6-k)/6. \tag{41}$$

So we have $k\leq 3$. The equality is achievable e.g., when $U=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}\otimes\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \omega & \omega^2 \\ 1 & \omega^2 & \omega \end{pmatrix}$.

(iii) Suppose some order-six CHM U contains an order-three submatrix of rank one. We can find two complex permutation matrices P and Q such that the upper-left order-three submatrix X of PUQ have all elements $1/\sqrt{6}$,

and the first column vector of PUQ also have all elements $1/\sqrt{6}$. Since PUQ is unitary, the second and third column vectors of the order-three submatrix of PUQ below X are both equal to $-\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(1,1,1)^T$. Then the second and third column vectors of PUQ are not orthogonal. This is a contradiction with the unitarity of PUQ.

The second claim follows from Lemma 6 (v).

Third, if U contains a singular matrix of order five, then it follows from Lemma 6 (v) that U contains a zero entry. It is a contradiction with the fact that every entry of U is nonzero.

(iv) The "if" part can be proved straightforwardly. Let us prove the "only if" part. Up to the equivalence, we may assume that the left-upper order-two submatrix of the CHM $U = [a_{ij}]$ is the subunitary matrix $\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$, and $a_{j1} = 1/\sqrt{6}$ for $j = 3, 4, 5, 6$. Since U is unitary, we have $\sum_{j=3}^{6} a_{j2} = 0$. Since $|a_{j2}| = 1/\sqrt{6}$, we have $a_{32} = -a_{42}$ and $a_{52} = -a_{62}$ up to a permutation of the subscripts by Lemma 6 (iv). Up to the equivalence, the CHM contains two product column vectors $(1,1)^T/\sqrt{2} \otimes (1,1,1)^T/\sqrt{3}$ and $(1,-1)^T/\sqrt{2} \otimes (1, \sqrt{6}a_{32}, \sqrt{6}a_{52})^T/\sqrt{3}$. By choosing $|a\rangle, |a^\perp\rangle = (1, \pm 1)^T/\sqrt{2}$ we have found the two product column vectors.

(v) The "if" part is trivial. We prove the "only if" part. Suppose the order-six CHM U has a submatrix of size 3×2 with orthogonal column vectors. Up to equivalence we may assume that the submatrix is in the upper left corner of U, and it is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \omega \\ 1 & \omega^2 \end{pmatrix}$. Up to equivalence we may assume that the lower left submatrix of size 3×2 of U is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & x \\ 1 & x\omega \\ 1 & x\omega^2 \end{pmatrix}$ with some complex number x of modulus one. So the first two column vectors of U are both product column vectors $|a, b\rangle, |c, b^\perp\rangle$ where $|b\rangle, |b^\perp\rangle$ is an orthonormal basis in $\mathbb{C}^3$.

(vi) The first assertion follows from the fact [15, Theorem 11]. The same fact implies that

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ z_3^* & -z_3^* \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_2 \\ a_1 a_3 & -a_2 a_3 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & z_1^* \\ 1 & -z_1^* \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ y^* & -x^* \end{pmatrix}, \tag{42}$$

where x, y are complex numbers. By respectively comparing the diagonal elements and off-diagonal elements of the matrix in Eq. 42, we have

$$(a_1^* a_2^* a_3^* - z_1^* z_3^*)(a_1 - a_1 a_3 - a_2 - a_2 a_3) = 0, \tag{43}$$
$$(a_1^* a_2^* a_3^* - z_1^* z_3^*)(a_1 - a_1 a_3 + a_2 + a_2 a_3) = 0. \tag{44}$$

Note that in deriving the first equation above we have used that $a_1^* a_2^* a_3^*(a_1 - a_1 a_3 - a_2 - a_2 a_3) = a_2^* a_3^* - a_2^* - a_1^* a_3^* - a_1^*$. If $a_1^* a_2^* a_3^* - z_1^* z_3^* \neq 0$ then $a_1 - a_1 a_3 = a_2 + a_2 a_3 = 0$. The equations have no solution. Hence $a_1^* a_2^* a_3^* - z_1^* z_3^* = 0$ and we obtain (31). We apply the above argument to the remaining three order-two sub-unitaries of the lower right corner of (30) and obtain (32)-(34), respectively. Next, [15, Theorem 11] implies that (42) is equal to $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ z_4^* & -z_4^* \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & d_2 \\ d_1 d_3 & -d_2 d_3 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & z_2^* \\ 1 & -z_2^* \end{pmatrix}$. The equation, (31) and (34) imply (35) and (36). One can similarly prove (37) and (38).

(vi.a) and (vi.b) are clear.

(vii) The assertion follows from the proof of [15, Theorem 11].

(viii) Suppose there exists an order-six CHM Y containing (39). Up to equivalence we may assume that Y is in the dephased form and (39) is the upper left corner of Y. Applying Lemma 6 (xii) to (39), we can show $(1 + w^* + y^* + z^*)(1 + w + x^* y + xz) \in \mathbb{R}$. It can be simplified as $(1 + w^*)(1 - x^*)(y - xz) \in \mathbb{R}$. It is a contradiction with the assumption. So the assertion holds.

(ix) The assertion without the last sentence follows from [21, Lemma 3 (i)]. The assertion Tr $D_j^2 = 3/2$ follows from the fact that the CHM has elements of modulus $1/\sqrt{6}$. Since the element of any unitary matrix has modulus at most one, Tr $D_j^2 = 3/2$ implies that the diagonal line of D_j has at most one zero element.

(x) Left-multiply the spectral matrix of (6) by a diagonal matrix $\mathrm{diag}(\omega^2, \omega, 1, 1, \omega^2, \omega^2)$, and right multiply by the following matrix:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & \omega^2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{45}$$

we obtain

$$S' = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \begin{pmatrix} \omega^2 & \omega & \omega^2 & 1 & \omega^2 & \omega^2 \\ 1 & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega^2 \\ \omega & \omega & 1 & 1 & \omega & 1 \\ \omega^2 & \omega^2 & 1 & \omega^2 & \omega & \omega^2 \\ 1 & \omega^2 & \omega^2 & 1 & \omega & \omega \\ \omega^2 & 1 & \omega^2 & \omega & \omega & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{46}$$

The S' has Schmidt rank three. Its upper left 3×3 submatrix is a subunitary matrix, while the upper left and bottom right 3×3 submatrices are equal.

This completes the proof. ■

In spite of Lemma 7 (iii), the order-six CHM may contain an order-three submatrix of rank two and an order-three subunitary matrix. An example is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \omega & \omega^2 \\ 1 & \omega^2 & \omega \end{pmatrix}$. We will show that such a CHM cannot be a member of any MUB trio in Lemma 11 (vii). Besides, Lemma 7 (iv) and (v) are the only two subcases of the case that a CHM contains two product column vectors. The case of Lemma 7 (iv), namely an order-six CHM containing an order-two subunitary matrix, has been investigated in [15] and (vi). The matrices A_{ij} in (vi) are subject to the constraints given in [15, Theorem 11]. A subcase of this CHM is the Szollosi family in [7, Eq. (C.12)].

We point out that the order-six CHM U does not contain an order-four or order-five subunitary matrix V. We explain the reason for the order-four case and one can similarly prove the order-five case. If U contains an order-four V then there exist two permutation matrices P and Q such that the upper-left order-four submatrix R of PUQ is a subunitary matrix. Since PUQ is an CHM, the four 2-dimensional column vectors below R are pairwise orthogonal. It is a contradiction with the fact that the vectors are all nonzero. On the other hand U may contain an order-two subunitary matrix. For example F_6 in (1) contains an order-two submatrix $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$.

If $a_1 = 1$ in (30) then (30) contains two singular order-two submatrices. However it seems still hard to exclude (30) as a member of some MUB trio.

Next, (35)-(38) imply that the second and third order-two subunitary matrices of the bottom two rows of (30) are decided by the counterpart of the middle two rows of (30). One can further show that the orthogonality of the row vectors of (30) implies that the second and third order-two subunitary matrices of the middle two rows of (30) is related to each other by a linear relation. Hence, the center order-two submatrix of (30) decides its three adjacent order-two subunitary matrices in the lower right corner of (30). In other word, (30) is the function of the parameters z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4 and a_1, a_2. It is known that z_2, z_3, z_4 are the functions of z_1 by [15, Theorem 11]. So (30) are the functions of three parameters z_1, a_1 and a_2. This fact coincides with [15, Theorem 11].

B. MUBs

In this subsection we investigate the MUBs. In Lemma 8 we present a simple argument for why there is at least one vector unbiased to any two given orthonormal bases in any dimension. We discuss the number of such vectors in Conjecture 9 and Lemma 10. The main result of this subsection is Lemma 11. We shall construct several order-six CHMs that cannot be a member of any MUB trio.

Lemma 8. *Let d be an integer greater than 1.*
(i) For any two orthonormal bases in $\mathbb{C}^d$, there is a normalized vector unbiased to both bases. Equivalently, for any unitary matrix of order d, there is a normalized vector with d elements of equal modulus such that it is unbiased to all column vectors of the matrix.
(ii) For any two MUBs in $\mathbb{C}^d$, there is a normalized vector unbiased to both MUBs. Equivalently, for any CHM of order d, there is a normalized vector with d elements of equal modulus such that it is unbiased to all column vectors of the matrix.

Proof. (i) Suppose U is an order-d unitary matrix. It follows from Lemma 6 (xiv) that there are diagonal unitaries L and R such that $B := LU^\dagger R$ is doubly quasistochastic (i.e. B satisfies that its row and column sums are all one). Denote the column vectors of U as $\vec{v}_i$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, d$, then the row vectors of $U^\dagger$ are $\vec{v}_i^\dagger$. Since the B has its row sums being one, we have $B\vec{e} = \vec{e}$, where $\vec{e}$ is the vector with all its d elements being 1. Let the column vector formed by the diagonal elements of R be $\vec{f}$. The equations $B = LU^\dagger R$ and $B\vec{e} = \vec{e}$ imply that $LU^\dagger R\vec{e} = \vec{e}$. Since $R\vec{e} = \vec{f}$, the previous equation can be written as $U^\dagger \vec{f} = L^\dagger \vec{e}$. Hence, the inner product of $\vec{v}_i$ and $\vec{f}$, i.e., $\sum_j [v_i(j)]^* f(j)$ is of

unit modulus, where $v_i(j)$ and $f(j)$ are the elements of $\vec{v}_i$ and $\vec{f}$, respectively. Then, the vector $\vec{f}/\sqrt{d}$ is the desired normalized vector unbiased to all column vectors of U.

(ii) The assertion is a corollary of (i). ■

We say a vector is dephased if it is a zero vector or if its first nonzero element is real and positive. For any given U, we call a dephased normalized vector unbiased to all columns vectors of both I_d (identity matrix of the same order as U) and U as a MU vector of U. Let $N_v(U)$ denote the number of such vectors.

Conjecture 9. *(i) For any CHM U of order six, $N_v(U)$ is finite.*
(ii) $N_v(U)$ has a fixed upper bound while the choice of the order-six CHM U varies.

It is known that $N_v(U)$ is finite for the order-six Fourier matrix and a few other special order-six CHMs [7]. There exists a continuous family of triplets of MUBs constructed based on the bicirculant Hadamard matrix in the third paragraph of [22, p87]. According to the numerical calculations in [7], the bicirculant Hadamard matrices appear to also satisfy that $N_v(U)$ is finite. Similar numerical results hold for all other classes of order-six CHMs considered in [7]. Analogies of the Conjecture 9 are known to be true for dimensions $2, 3$ and 5, but false for dimension 4 [7]. According to [7], all the CHMs of order $2, 3, 5$ satisfy that $N_v(U)$ is a finite even number. Such statement for the (incomplete) classes of order-six CHMs considered in [7] is supported by numerical evidence presented in [7] and in [23].

Lemma 10. *Let U be a unitary matrix. Then $N_v(U)$, $N_v(U^\dagger)$, $N_v(U^*)$, $N_v(U^T)$ are equal and they may be infinite.*

Proof. Suppose the Sinkhorn normal form of U is $U = D_1 B D_2$, where D_1 and D_2 are diagonal unitaries, and B is doubly quasistochastic. We have $U^\dagger = D_2^\dagger B^\dagger D_1^\dagger$, where $B^\dagger$ is also doubly quasistochastic. From the proof of Lemma 8, it can be figured out that a MU vector of U is the vectorization of the diagonal of D_1, thus it is in one-to-one correspondence with D_1. Similarly, a dephased normalized vector unbiased to I_d and $U^\dagger$ is in one-to-one correspondence with D_2. It is easy to see that the D_1 and D_2 in the Sinkhorn normal form of U are in one-to-one correspondence with each other for a fixed U. Thus there is a bijection between the MU vectors of U and those of $U^\dagger$. Hence $N_v(U)$ and $N_v(U^\dagger)$ are equal. They are both infinite when $U = I$. It can also be shown that they are both infinite whenever U is block-diagonal, by multiplying the unbiased vectors for individual blocks by suitable factors and concatenate them into a normalized vector.

From $U^* = D_1^* B^* D_2^*$, we similarly have that the MU vectors of U^* are in one-to-one correspondence with D_1. Thus $N_v(U)$ and $N_v(U^*)$ are equal. The $N_v(U^T)$ is also equal to them by applying the assertion that $N_v(U)$ and $N_v(U^\dagger)$ are equal to U^*. This completes the proof. ■

In the following lemma, we first review a few known results on the product MUBs. Then we construct several order-six CHMs that cannot be a member of any MUB trio.

Lemma 11. *(i) If a normalized vector is mutually unbiased to $d-1$ vectors in an orthonormal basis in $\mathbb{C}^d$, then it is also unbiased to the d'th vector in the basis.*
(ii) An order-six CHM is a member of some MUB trio if and only if so is its adjoint matrix, if and only if so is its complex conjugate, and if and only if so is its transpose.
(ii.a) Let k be a positive integer at most three. Then k order-six CHMs are the members of some MUB trio if and only if so are their complex conjugate.
(iii) The product state $|a, b\rangle$ in $\mathbb{C}^d$ is MU to an orthogonal product-vector basis $\{|x_i, y_i\rangle\}_{i=1,\cdots,d}$ if and only if $|a\rangle$ is MU to $\{|x_i\rangle_{i=1,\cdots,d}$ and $|b\rangle$ is MU to $\{|y_i\rangle\}_{i=1,\cdots,d}$.
(iv) Any set of three product-vector MUBs in the space $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^3$ is LU equivalent to either

$$\mathcal{T}_0 := \{|a_j, d_k\rangle, |b_j, e_k\rangle, |c_j, f_k\rangle\} \tag{47}$$

or

$$\mathcal{T}_1 := \{|a_j, d_k\rangle, |b_j, e_k\rangle, |c_0, f_k\rangle, |c_1, g_k\rangle\}, \tag{48}$$

where $\{|a_j\rangle\}, \{|b_j\rangle\}$ and $\{|c_j\rangle\}$ is a complete set of MUBs in $\mathbb{C}^2$, and $\{|d_j\rangle\}, \{|e_j\rangle\}, \{|f_j\rangle\}$ and $\{|g_j\rangle\}$ is a complete set of MUBs in $\mathbb{C}^3$.
(v) Any set of three product-vector MUBs in the space $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^3$ is not MU to a single state.
(vi) Any set of four MUBs in $\mathbb{C}^6$ contains at most one product-vector basis. Equivalently, any two of four MUBs in $\mathbb{C}^6$ contain at most ten product vectors.

(vii) Any MUB trio contains none of the thirteen order-six CHMs

$$Y_1, \tag{49}$$
$$Y_2, \tag{50}$$
$$Y_3, \tag{51}$$
$$Y_4, \tag{52}$$
$$Y_5, \tag{53}$$
$$Y_6, \tag{54}$$
$$Y_7, \tag{55}$$
$$Y_8, \tag{56}$$
$$Y_9, \tag{57}$$
$$Y_{10}, \tag{58}$$
$$Y_{11}, \tag{59}$$
$$\Big(U \otimes I_3\Big) \cdot \begin{pmatrix} V_1 & 0 \\ 0 & D_1 V_1 D_2 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \Big(X \otimes I_3\Big), \tag{60}$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} V_2 & 0 \\ 0 & W_2 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} D_3 & D_4 \\ D_4 & -D_3 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} V_3 & 0 \\ 0 & W_3 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{61}$$

where

1. *Y_1 contains an order-three subunitary matrix.*
2. *Y_2 contains a submatrix of size 3×2 and rank one.*
3. *Y_3 contains an order-three submatrix whose one column vector is orthogonal to the other two column vectors.*
4. *three column vectors of Y_4 are product vectors.*
5. *Y_5 contains an order-three singular submatrix.*
6. *Y_6 contains a real submatrix of size 3×2.*
7. *two column vectors of Y_7 are product vectors $|a, b\rangle$ and $|a, c\rangle$.*
8. *Y_8 contains an order-four submatrix.*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & x & y^* \\ 1 & x^* & 1 & z \\ 1 & y & z^* & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{62}$$

   where x, y, z are complex numbers of modulus one.

9. *Y_9 contains an order-two subunitary matrix and an order-two singular matrix at the same time. The two matrices belong to exactly two columns of Y_9.*
10. *Y_{10} contains a submatrix of size 4×3 whose one column vector is orthogonal to the other two column vectors.*
11. *The first three columns of Y_{11} can be written as $\begin{pmatrix} D_1 V D_2 \\ V \end{pmatrix}$, where D_1 and $D_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & b \\ c & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ are both order-three GPMs.*
12. *In Eq. (60), U and X are both order-two unitary matrices, V_1 is an order-three unitary matrix, and D_1, D_2 are both order-three diagonal unitary matrices.*
13. *In Eq. (61), V_2, V_3, W_2 and W_3 are all order-three unitary matrices, D_3 and D_4 are both diagonal matrices of real and nonnegative elements and (1) V_3 and W_3 both have four zero elements, or (2) one of D_3 and D_4 is singular, or (3) D_3 and D_4 are proportional, or (4) V_3 and W_3 respectively have one and six zero elements.*

(viii) Suppose $v_1, \cdots, , v_d$ and $w_1, \cdots, , w_d$ are two MUBs in $\mathbb{C}^d$. Then $v_1, w_2, \cdots, , w_d$ are linearly independent. Further
(viii.a) If $d = 6$ and the two MUBs can be extended to four MUBs, then $v_1, v_2, v_3, w_4, w_5, w_6$ are linearly independent.
(viii.b) If $d = 6$ and the two MUBs can be extended to four MUBs, then any five vectors of the twelve vectors $v_1, \cdots, , v_6, w_1, \cdots, , w_6$ are linearly independent. If furthermore one of the two MUBs is the identity matrix, some six vectors of the twelve vectors are linearly dependent then the other one of the two MUBs contain a singular order-two submatrix.

Proof. The statement (i) is clear. The local equivalence in (i) is the same as that in [24, p4], which applies to only the product-vector MUBs in (iv).

We prove the first equivalence of statement (ii). Suppose that the CHM A is a member of an MUB trio, and that I, A, B, C are four MUB matrices, then $I, A^\dagger, A^\dagger B, A^\dagger C$ are another four MUB matrices, so the latter three matrices form an MUB trio, thus $A^\dagger$ is a member of an MUB trio. Next, the second equivalence of statement (ii) follows from the definition of MUB trios. Further the third equivalence of statement (ii) follows from the first and second equivalence. Finally, statement (ii.a) follows from the definition of MUB trios.

Next, statement (iii) is from [24, Theorem 1] and [25, Lemma 3]. Statement (iv) and (v) are respectively from [24, Theorem 3] and [24, Theorem 4]. An exhaustive classification of any pair of product-vector MUBs has also been given in [24, Theorem 2]. The first part of statement (vi) is proved in the second paragraph below Eq. (22) of [6]. If some two of four MUBs in $\mathbb{C}^6$ contain more than ten product vectors, then (i) together with the case $k = 5$ of Lemma 6 (xx) imply that the two MUBs are all product vectors. It is a contradiction with the first part of (vi). On the other hand the implication from the second statement of (vi) to the first statement of (vi) is clear. So we have proved the equivalence between the two statements.

Next we prove the statement (vii) with Eqs. (49)-(57). For each equation we shall assume that the Y_j is a member of some MUB trio. Using the unitary equivalence in Definition 4 (i) and (iii), the matrix

$$PY_jQ \tag{63}$$

is still a member of some MUB trio for any order-six complex permutation matrices P and Q. By regarding PY_jQ as the new Y_j, we can place any submatrix of Y_j in the upper-left corner of Y_j.

For (vii) with (49), we assume that the order-three submatrix V_0 of the partitioned order-six CHM $Y_1 = \begin{pmatrix} V_0 & V_1 \\ V_2 & V_3 \end{pmatrix}$ is a subunitary matrix. By computation one can show that $\sqrt{2}V_0$ and $\sqrt{2}V_2$ are both order-three unitary matrices. It follows from Definition 4 (i) that there are four MUBs which contain two members

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}V_0^\dagger & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{2}V_2^\dagger \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} I_3/\sqrt{2} & \sqrt{2}V_0^\dagger V_1 \\ I_3/\sqrt{2} & \sqrt{2}V_2^\dagger V_3 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{64}$$

Since the second matrix is unitary, we obtain that $V_0^\dagger V_1 = -V_2^\dagger V_3$. So both matrices in (64) represent product-vector bases. It is a contradiction with assertion (vi). So Y_1 is not a member of any MUB trio.

For (vii) with (50), we assume that the upper left 3×2 submatrix of $Y_2 = [a_{ij}]$ has rank one and all elements $1/\sqrt{6}$, and all elements of the first column vector of Y_2 are also $1/\sqrt{6}$. Since Y_2 is an order-six CHM, we obtain that $a_{i2} = -1/\sqrt{6}$ for $i = 4, 5, 6$. By the same reason we obtain that the vector (a_{1j}, a_{2j}, a_{3j}) for $j = 3, 4, 5, 6$ is orthogonal to the vector $(1, 1, 1)$. So (a_{1j}, a_{2j}, a_{3j}) is proportional to $(1, \omega, \omega^2)$ or $(1, \omega^2, \omega)$ by Lemma 6 (i). It follows from Lemma 7 (iii) that exactly two of (a_{1j}, a_{2j}, a_{3j}) for $j = 3, 4, 5, 6$ are proportional to $(1, \omega, \omega^2)$ and exactly two of them are proportional to $(1, \omega^2, \omega)$. So the three upper rows of Y_2 contains an order-three subunitary matrix. The CHM Y_2 is not a member of any MUB trio by (vii) with (49).

For (vii) with (51), we assume that the partitioned order-six CHM $Y_3 = \begin{pmatrix} V_0 & V_1 \\ V_2 & V_3 \end{pmatrix}$ has the order-three submatrix V_0, and the first column and row vectors of Y_3 have all elements $1/\sqrt{6}$. Further the first column vector of V_0 is orthogonal to another two column vectors of V_0. They are $\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(1, \omega, \omega^2)^T$ or $\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(1, \omega^2, \omega)^T$ by Lemma 6 (i). These two column vectors must be the same, from (vii) with (49). The CHM Y_3 is not a member of any MUB trio by (vii) with (50).

For (vii) with (52), we assume that the leftmost three column vectors of Y_4 are all product vectors $|a_j, b_j\rangle$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$, and the modulus of the elements of $|a_j\rangle$ and $|b_j\rangle$ are respectively $1/\sqrt{2}$ and $1/\sqrt{3}$. If the $|a_j\rangle$ are pairwise non-orthogonal, then the $|b_j\rangle$ are pairwise orthogonal. So Y_4 contains an order-three subunitary matrix. This is a contradiction with (vii) with (49) because Y_4 is a member of some MUB trio. So two of $|a_j\rangle, j = 1, 2, 3$ are orthogonal. If the remaining vector is proportional to neither of them, then Y_4 contains an order-three submatrix whose one column vector is orthogonal to the other two column vectors of the submatrix. This is a contradiction with (vii)

with (51). So two of $|a_j\rangle, j = 1, 2, 3$ form an orthonormal basis in $\mathbb{C}^2$ and the third vector is proportional to one of them. Using suitable P and Q in (63) we may assume that $|a_1\rangle = |a_2\rangle = (1, 1)^T/\sqrt{2}$, $|a_3\rangle = (1, -1)^T/\sqrt{2}$, $|b_1\rangle = (1, \omega, \omega^2)^T/\sqrt{3}$, $|b_2\rangle = (1, \omega^2, \omega)^T/\sqrt{3}$, and the fourth column vector of Y_4 is denoted as $(1, a_{24}, a_{34}, a_{44}, a_{54}, a_{64})^T/\sqrt{6}$ with $|a_{j4}| = 1$. Since the first, second and fourth column vectors of Y_4 are pairwise orthogonal, we obtain that $(1 + a_{44}, a_{24} + a_{54}, a_{34} + a_{64})$ is orthogonal to $|b_1\rangle$ and $|b_2\rangle$. Hence $(1 + a_{44}, a_{24} + a_{54}, a_{34} + a_{64}) \propto (1, 1, 1)$. We have

$$1 + a_{44} = a_{24} + a_{54} = a_{34} + a_{64}. \tag{65}$$

If they are zero then the fourth column vector of Y_4 is a product vector $|a_4, b_4\rangle = (1, -1)^T/\sqrt{2} \otimes (1, a_{24}, a_{34})^T/\sqrt{3}$. Since $|a_3, b_3\rangle \perp |a_4, b_4\rangle$ and $|a_3\rangle = |a_4\rangle$, we have $|b_3\rangle \perp |b_4\rangle$. Let $|g\rangle \perp |b_3\rangle, |b_4\rangle$. Since Y_4 is an order-six CHM, the rightmost two column vectors of Y_4 are in the span of $(1, 1)^T \otimes (1, 1, 1)^T$ and $(1, -1)^T \otimes |g\rangle$, and proportional to neither of them by (vi) and Lemma 6 (iii). This condition and the fact that Y_4 has elements of modulus $1/\sqrt{6}$ imply that the elements of $|g\rangle$ are $\pm 1/\sqrt{6}$. So the rightmost two column vectors of Y_4 form a submatrix of Y_4 containing a submatrix of size 3×2 and rank one. This is a contradiction with (vii) with (50).

It remains to investigate the case that (65) is nonzero. Since $|a_{j4}| = 1$, Lemma 6 (iv) implies that the two 2-tuples (a_{24}, a_{54}) and (a_{34}, a_{64}) are equal to $(1, a_{44})$ or $(a_{44}, 1)$. So the fourth column vector of Y_4 is one of the following four vectors

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & a'_{44} & a''_{44} \\ 1 & a_{44} & 1 & a''_{44} \\ a'''_{44} & a_{44} & a'_{44} & a''_{44} \\ a'''_{44} & a_{44} & 1 & 1 \\ a'''_{44} & 1 & a'_{44} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{66}$$

where we have used the modulus-one complex numbers $a_{44}, a'_{44}, a''_{44}, a'''_{44}$ to distinguish the vectors. Since $|b_1\rangle = (1, \omega, \omega^2)^T/\sqrt{3}$, $|b_2\rangle = (1, \omega^2, \omega)^T/\sqrt{3}$, the first vector in (66) is excluded by (vii) with (49). The same reason implies that $a_{44}, a'_{44}, a''_{44} \neq 1$. We apply the above argument to obtain that the fifth and sixth column vectors of Y_4 are also equal to one of the rightmost three column vectors of (66). (vii) with (50) implies that the rightmost three column vectors of Y_4 are respectively equal to the rightmost three column vectors of (66) up to a permutation of the columns. They are orthogonal to $|a_3, b_3\rangle$ because Y_4 is unitary. Since $|a_3\rangle = (1, 1)^T/\sqrt{2}$, $|b_3\rangle$ is orthogonal to $(1, 1, -1), (1, -1, 1)$ and $(-1, 1, 1)$. This is a contradiction with the fact that $|b_3\rangle$ is nonzero. So Y_4 is not a member of any MUB trio.

For (vii) with (53), first of all we investigate the case when Y_5 contains a singular matrix of order three. We assume that the partitioned order-six CHM $Y_5 = \begin{pmatrix} V_0 & V_1 \\ V_2 & V_3 \end{pmatrix}$ has the singular order-three submatrix V_0, and the first column and row vectors of Y_5 have all elements $1/\sqrt{6}$. If the second column vector of V_0 has three distinct entries then the third column vector of V_0 is proportional to one of the first two column vectors of V_0 by Lemma 5. It is a contradiction with (vii) with (50). So the second column vector of V_0 has exactly two distinct entries. Since V_0 is singular, the third column vector of V_0 also has exactly two distinct entries, and the same entries in the second and third column vectors of V_0 are in the same row of V_0. So V_0 contains a 2×3 submatrix of rank one. The CHM Y_5 is not a member of any MUB trio by (vii) with (50) and (ii).

For (vii) with (54), we assume that the first column vector of Y_6 has all entries $1/\sqrt{6}$, the upper left 3×2 submatrix of Y_6 is real, all but the last entry x of the submatrix are equal to $1/\sqrt{6}$, and $x = 1/\sqrt{6}$ or $-1/\sqrt{6}$. The former case is excluded by (vii) with (50). If $x = -1/\sqrt{6}$, then Lemma 6 (iv) shows that the bottom three elements of the second column vector of Y_6 are $-1/\sqrt{6}$, $s/\sqrt{6}$ and $-s/\sqrt{6}$ with some complex number s of modulus one. Up to equivalence the first two column vectors are $(1, 1)^T/\sqrt{2} \otimes (1, 1, 1)^T/\sqrt{3}$ and $(1, -1)^T/\sqrt{2} \otimes (1, 1, s)^T/\sqrt{3}$. They are orthogonal to the third column vector of Y_6. By computation we can show that the third and the sixth element of the vector are zero. It is a contradiction with the fact that Y_6 is a CHM.

For (vii) with (55), we assume that the leftmost two column vectors of Y_7 are product vectors $|a, b\rangle$ and $|a, c\rangle$. Using suitable P and Q in (63) we may assume that $|a\rangle = (1, 1)^T/\sqrt{2}$, $|b\rangle = (1, \omega, \omega^2)^T/\sqrt{3}$, $|c\rangle = (1, \omega^2, \omega)^T/\sqrt{3}$, and the third column vector of Y_7 is denoted as $(1, a_{23}, a_{33}, a_{43}, a_{53}, a_{63})^T/\sqrt{6}$ with $|a_{j3}| = 1$. Since the column vectors of Y_7 are pairwise orthogonal, we obtain that $(1 + a_{43}, a_{23} + a_{53}, a_{33} + a_{63})$ is orthogonal to $|b\rangle$ and $|c\rangle$. Hence $(1 + a_{43}, a_{23} + a_{53}, a_{33} + a_{63}) \propto (1, 1, 1)$. We have

$$1 + a_{43} = a_{23} + a_{53} = a_{33} + a_{63}. \tag{67}$$

If they are zero then Y_7 contains a real submatrix of size 2×3. The assertion follows from (vii) with (54). If they are nonzero, then $|a_{j3}| = 1$ and Lemma 6 (iv) imply that the two 2-tuples (a_{23}, a_{53}) and (a_{33}, a_{63}) are equal to $(1, a_{43})$ or

$(a_{43}, 1)$. So the third column vector of Y_7 is one of the following four vectors

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & a'_{43} & a''_{43} \\ 1 & a_{43} & 1 & a''_{43} \\ a'''_{43} & a_{43} & a'_{43} & a''_{43} \\ a'''_{43} & a_{43} & 1 & 1 \\ a'''_{43} & 1 & a'_{43} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{68}$$

where we have used the modulus-one complex numbers $a_{44}, a'_{44}, a''_{44}, a'''_{44}$ to distinguish the vectors. Since $|b\rangle = (1, \omega, \omega^2)^T/\sqrt{3}$, $|c\rangle = (1, \omega^2, \omega)^T/\sqrt{3}$, the first vector in (68) is excluded by (vii) with (49). We apply the above argument to obtain that the rightmost four column vectors of Y_7 are equal to one of the rightmost three column vectors of (68). Hence two of the rightmost four column vectors of Y_7 are the same, and it is a contradiction with the fact that Y_7 is a CHM. So Y_7 is not a member of any MUB trio.

For (vii) with (56), up to equivalence we may assume that Y_8 is in the dephased form and (62) is the upper left corner of Y_8. It follows from [26, Lemma 2.7.] (a) that two of x, y, z are equal. We prove the assertion for $x = y$, and one can similarly prove the assertion for $x = z$ or $y = z$. Denote the last two elements on the second and third rows of Y_8 respectively as u, v and s, t. The orthogonality of the first three rows of Y_8 implies that

$$2 + x + x^* = -(u + v), \tag{69}$$

$$2 + x + z^* = -(s^* + t^*), \tag{70}$$

$$1 + 2x^* + xz = -(u^* s + v^* t). \tag{71}$$

Then Lemma 6 (xii) implies that

$$(2 + x + x^*)(2 + x + z^*)(1 + 2x^* + xz) \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{72}$$

If $x = -1$ then Y_8 contains a real matrix of size 3×2. The assertion follows from (vii) with (54). If $x \neq -1$ then $2 + x + x^* > 0$. (72) implies that $(2 + x + z^*)(1 + 2x^* + xz) \in \mathbb{R}$. We have $(2 + x + z^*)(1 + 2x^* + xz) = 2 + 4x^* + 2xz + x + 2 + x^2 z + z^* + 2x^* z^* + x \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence $x(-2 + xz + x^* z^*) \in \mathbb{R}$. We have $x \in \mathbb{R}$ or $xz = 1$. If $x \in \mathbb{R}$ then the assertion follows from (vii) with (54). On the other hand if $xz = 1$ then the orthogonality of the first two column vectors of Y_8 implies that the last two elements of the second column vector of Y_8 are complex conjugates of each other. Let them be a and a^*. The first four column vectors of Y_8 can be written as

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & x & x^* \\ 1 & x^* & 1 & x^* \\ 1 & x & x & 1 \\ 1 & a & b & d \\ 1 & a^* & c & e \end{pmatrix}, \tag{73}$$

where b, c, d, e are complex numbers of modulus one. The orthogonality of column vector 1, 3 and 4 of (73) implies that $2 + 2x^* = -b^* - c^* = -d - e$. The orthogonality of column 3 and 4 of (73) implies that $(1 + x^*)^2 + b^* d + c^* e = 0$. The two equations imply that

$$(d + e)^2 + 4b^* d + 4c^* e = 0. \tag{74}$$

Applying Lemma 6 (iv) to $-b^* - c^* = -d - e$, we obtain three cases: (i) $b = -c$, (ii) $b^* = e, c^* = d$, and (iii) $b^* = d, c^* = e$. In case (i), the orthogonality of column vector 1 and 3 of (73) implies that $x = -1$. So Y_8 contains a real matrix of size 3×2. The assertion follows from (vii) with (54). In case (ii), (74) implies that $|d| \neq |e|$. It is a contradiction with the fact that $|d| = |e| = 1$. So case (ii) is excluded. In case (iii), the orthogonality of column vector 2, 3 and 4 of (73) implies that $a^* d^* + a e^* = a d^* + a^* e^*$. Hence $a = a^*$ or $d = e$. If $a = a^*$ then the assertion follows from (vii) with (54). If $d = e$ then $b = c$. So Y_8 contains a 2×3 real matrix up to equivalence. So Y_8 is not a member of any MUB trio by assertion (ii) and (vii) with (54).

For (vii) with (57), suppose Y_9 is a member of some MUB trio. It follows from Lemma 7 (vi) that Y_9 is equivalent

to the CHM $\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} & A_{13} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} & A_{23} \\ A_{31} & A_{32} & A_{33} \end{pmatrix}$, where any A_{ij} is an order-two subunitary matrix and

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_{11} \\ A_{21} \\ A_{31} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \\ 1 & a \\ 1 & -a \\ 1 & b \\ 1 & -b \end{pmatrix}. \tag{75}$$

If Y_9 has exactly two columns containing an order-two subunitary matrix V and an order-two singular matrix W, then we may assume that the two columns are (75). Then we have $a, b \in \{1, -1\}$ or $a \in \{b, -b\}$. Either case is excluded by (vii) with (54).

For (vii) with (58), up to equivalence we may assume that the upper left submatrix V of size 4×3 of Y_{10} satisfies the hypothesis, i.e., the first column vector of V is orthogonal to the remaining two column vectors of V. Let W be the lower left submatrix in Y_{10} of size 2×3 that is below the submatrix V. Since Y_{10} is a CHM, the above facts imply that the first column vector of W is orthogonal to the remaining two column vectors of W. Up to equivalence We have $W = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$. It follows from (ii) and (vii) with (54) that Y_{10} is not a member of any MUB trio.

For (vii) with (59), since Y_{11} is an order-six CHM, the submatrices V and $D_1 V D_2$ both consist of elements of modulus $1/\sqrt{6}$. Since D_1 and D_2 are GPMs, they are both complex permutation matrices up to global factors. If Y_{11} is a member of some MUB trio, then so is $(D_1^\dagger \oplus I_3)Y_{11}$. This is a matrix of expression

$$\begin{pmatrix} v_2 & yv_3 & zv_1 \\ v_1 & v_2 & v_3 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{76}$$

where v_1, v_2 and v_3 are all 3-dimensional vectors of modulus $1/\sqrt{6}$, and y and z complex numbers. The orthogonality between the column vectors implies that v_1, v_2 and v_3 are pairwise orthogonal. It is a contradiction with (vii) with (49). So Y_{11} is not a member of any MUB trio.

Next we prove (vii) with (60). If an MUB trio contains $\left[U \otimes I_3\right] \cdot \begin{pmatrix} V_1 & 0 \\ 0 & D_1 V_1 D_2 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \left[X \otimes I_3\right]$ then Definition 4 (i) implies the existence of four MUBs containing $(I_3 \oplus D_1^\dagger) \cdot \left[U^\dagger \otimes I_3\right]$ and $\begin{pmatrix} V_1 & 0 \\ 0 & V_1 D_2 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \left[X \otimes I_3\right]$. They are both product-vector bases. It is a contradiction with assertion (vi). So we have proved (vii) with (60).

Finally we prove (vii) with (61). In case (1), denote the 3×6 matrix formed by the top three rows of the matrix in (61) as T. It can be shown that T contains a singular order-three submatrix. To see this, note that there may be two cases depending on the location of zero elements in V_3 and W_3 in (61): one is that the same rows in V_3 and W_3 contains two zero elements, in which case there are two columns of T that are proportional to each other; and in the remaining case, three columns of T form a linearly dependent set, where one column is from the first three or the last three columns of T, and the remaining two columns are from the other three columns of T. This is a contradiction with the claim about the matrix Y_5 in assertion (vii). We have proved (vii) with (61) for case (1). In case (2), the CHM contains a singular order-three submatrix. It is excluded by (vii) with (53). In case (3), if $D_3 \propto D_4$ then both of them are proportional to the identity matrix. So the CHM contains an order-three subunitary submatrix. It is excluded by (vii) with (49). In case (4) similarly to case (1), one can show that the top three rows contain three column vectors that are linearly dependent. We have proved (vii) with (61) for case (4).

(viii) Suppose $v_1, w_2, \cdots, , w_d$ are linearly dependent. Since $w_2, \cdots, , w_d$ are orthogonal vectors, the vector v_1 is the linear combination of them. Hence w_1 is orthogonal to v_1. It is a contradiction with the fact that their inner product has modulus $1/\sqrt{d}$, because $v_1, \cdots, , v_d$ and $w_1, \cdots, , w_d$ are two MUBs.

(viii.a) Up to unitary equivalence, we may assume that $(v_1, \cdots, , v_6) = I_6$ and $(w_4, w_5, w_6) = \begin{pmatrix} A \\ B \end{pmatrix}$, where A and B are both order-three matrices. If $v_1, v_2, v_3, w_4, w_5, w_6$ are linearly dependent, then there are six complex numbers $c_1, \cdots, , c_6$ one of which is nonzero, such that $\sum_{i=1}^{3} c_i v_i + \sum_{j=4}^{6} c_j w_j = 0$. Since $(v_1, \cdots, , v_6) = I_6$, one of c_4, c_5 and c_6 is nonzero. It implies that the column vectors of B are linearly dependent. So B is singular. The unitary equivalence implies that I_6 and $(w_1, \cdots, , w_6)$ are still two MUBs extendable to four MUBs. So $(w_1, \cdots, , w_6)$ is a member of some MUB trio. It is a contradiction with (vii) with (53), because B is singular.

(viii.b) Suppose $v_1, \cdots, , v_6, w_1, \cdots, , w_6$ contain five vectors which are linearly dependent. Without loss of generality, we may assume that the five vectors are one of the following three cases: w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4, w_5, or v_1, w_2, w_3, w_4, w_5, or

v_1, v_2, w_3, w_4, w_5. Either of them can be extended to a set of six linearly dependent vectors. Hence the first two cases are excluded by (viii) and the third case is excluded by (viii.a). Finally, the last assertion follows from (viii), (viii.a), (viii.b), and Lemma 6 (v).

This completes the proof. ■

We believe that statement (ii.a) does not hold when the "complex conjugate" is replaced by the "transpose". However we do not have a counterexample yet. If the statement with the replacement was true, then the statement with another replacement would be also true by (ii.a), i.e., replace the "complex conjugate" by "adjoint matrices".

In Lemma 11 (vii), we note that Y_1 is a special case of Y_3, and Y_2 is a special case of Y_6 up to the equivalence of MUB trios. The so-called Fourier family of Hadamard matrices $F(a,b)$ and $C(t)$ constructed respectively in Eq. (3) and below Eq. (21) of [27] both have a 2×3 submatrix of rank one. The main result of the paper [27] says that $F(a,b)$ cannot be a member of any MUB trio. Since the matrix Y_2 contains $F(a,b)$, the main conclusion of [27] is included as a special case of Lemma 11. Further, the matrix Y_8 is the same as the matrix H in [26, Lemma 2.7.] and plays the fundamental role in studying the self-adjoint order-six CHM [26].

Further, Lemma 11 (vii) shows the fact that the CHM cannot be a member of any MUB trio when the CHM contains a submatrix of size $k \times 3$ and one column vector of the submatrix is orthogonal to the other two column vectors. Indeed the lemma has proved the fact when $k = 2, 3, 4$. One can straightforwardly show that $k \neq 1$ and 5, because the CHM has only nonzero elements.

C. The Schmidt rank of matrices in an MUB trio

In this subsection we introduce the main results of this paper. We characterize the CHMs of Schmidt rank one, two and three by giving equalities and inequalities involving their parameters in Lemma 12. Then we show that the member of any MUB trio has Schmidt rank at least three in Theorem 3. We further show in Corollary 13 that if a set of four MUBs in $\mathbb{C}^6$ contains the identity, then any other MUB in the set has min-Schmidt rank at least three.

Lemma 12. *(i) Any Schmidt-rank-one order-six CHM is locally equivalent to*

$$\mathbb{H}_1 := \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \omega & \omega^2 \\ 1 & \omega^2 & \omega \end{pmatrix}. \tag{77}$$

(ii) Up to a product complex permutation matrix from the right hand side, any Schmidt-rank-two order-six CHM can be written as

$$\mathbb{H}_2(\alpha,\beta,\gamma,V,W) := \left[\begin{pmatrix} \cos\alpha & \sin\alpha \\ e^{i\gamma}\sin\alpha & -e^{i\gamma}\cos\alpha \end{pmatrix} \otimes I_3 \right] \cdot \begin{pmatrix} V & 0 \\ 0 & W \end{pmatrix} \cdot \left[\begin{pmatrix} \cos\beta & \sin\beta \\ \sin\beta & -\cos\beta \end{pmatrix} \otimes I_3 \right], \tag{78}$$

where $V = [v_{jk}]$ and $W = [w_{jk}]$ are linearly independent order-three unitary matrices and

$$\alpha, \beta \in [0, \pi/4], \quad \alpha + \beta \geq \pi/4, \quad \gamma \in [0, 2\pi), \tag{79}$$

$$\cos 2\alpha \cos 2\beta + \frac{3(v_{jk}w_{jk}^* + v_{jk}^* w_{jk})}{2} \sin 2\alpha \sin 2\beta = 0, \tag{80}$$

$$|v_{jk}|^2 + |w_{jk}|^2 = 2/3, \tag{81}$$

$$(|v_{jk}|^2 - 1/3)\cos 2\alpha = 0, \tag{82}$$

$$(|v_{jk}|^2 - 1/3)\cos 2\beta = 0. \tag{83}$$

Hence
(ii.a) If $(\alpha,\beta) \neq (\pi/4, \pi/4)$ then (79) and (80) both hold, V and W are both CHMs.
(ii.b) If $(\alpha,\beta) = (\pi/4, \pi/4)$ then $\gamma \in [0, 2\pi)$, $v_{jk}^* w_{jk} + v_{jk} w_{jk}^* = 0$, and $|v_{jk}|^2 + |w_{jk}|^2 = 2/3$.
(ii.c) If $\mathbb{H}_2(\alpha,\beta,\gamma,V,W)$ is a member of some MUB trio, then $\alpha + \beta > \pi/4$.
(ii.d) $\mathbb{H}_2(\alpha,\beta,\gamma,V,W)$ is not a member of any MUB trio.
(iii) Any Schmidt-rank-three order-six CHM can be written as

$$\mathbb{H}_3(\alpha_1,\beta_1,\gamma_1,\alpha_2,\beta_2,\gamma_2,\alpha_3,\beta_3,\gamma_3,V,W) := \tag{84}$$

$$(I_2 \otimes V) \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \cos\alpha_1 & 0 & 0 & e^{i\gamma_1}\sin\alpha_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos\alpha_2 & 0 & 0 & e^{i\gamma_2}\sin\alpha_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cos\alpha_3 & 0 & 0 & e^{i\gamma_3}\sin\alpha_3 \\ e^{i\beta_1}\sin\alpha_1 & 0 & 0 & -e^{i(\beta_1+\gamma_1)}\cos\alpha_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\beta_2}\sin\alpha_2 & 0 & 0 & -e^{i(\beta_2+\gamma_2)}\cos\alpha_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\beta_3}\sin\alpha_3 & 0 & 0 & -e^{i(\beta_3+\gamma_3)}\cos\alpha_3 \end{pmatrix} \cdot (I_2 \otimes W),$$

where V and W are order-three unitary matrices, the first column vector of W have all nonnegative and real elements, and

$$\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \in [0, \pi/2], \qquad \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3 \in [0, 2\pi). \tag{85}$$

Hence
(iii.a) If $\mathbb{H}_3(\alpha_1, \beta_1, \gamma_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2, \gamma_2, \alpha_3, \beta_3, \gamma_3, V, W)$ is a member of some MUB trio, then $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \in (0, \pi/2)$.

Proof. (i) Any Schmidt-rank-one order-six CHM can be written as $U \otimes V$ where U and V are respectively an order-two and order-three CHM. It is known that U is equivalent to $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$, and V is equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \omega & \omega^2 \\ 1 & \omega^2 & \omega \end{pmatrix}, \tag{86}$$

see [7]. So the assertion holds. Note that The CHM $\mathbb{H}_1$ stands for a product-vector basis in $\mathbb{C}^6$.

(ii) Any Schmidt-rank-two bipartite unitary is a controlled unitary [9]. So any Schmidt-rank-two order-six CHM Y can be written as $(S \otimes I_3)(T \oplus U)(X \otimes I_3)$ where S and X are order-two unitary matrices, and T and U are order-three unitary matrices. We can find order-two complex permutation matrices D_1, D_2 and D_3 such that $SD_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\alpha & \sin\alpha \\ e^{i\gamma}\sin\alpha & -e^{i\gamma}\cos\alpha \end{pmatrix}$, $D_2 X D_3 = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\beta & \sin\beta \\ \sin\beta & -\cos\beta \end{pmatrix}$, $\alpha, \beta \in [0, \pi/4]$, $\gamma \in [0, 2\pi]$ and $(D_1^\dagger \otimes I_3)(T \oplus U)(D_2^\dagger \otimes I_3) = V \oplus W$. Since Y has Schmidt rank two and local unitaries does not change the Schmidt rank of Y, we obtain that V and W are linearly independent. So we have obtained (78) and

$$Y = \begin{pmatrix} (\cos\alpha\cos\beta)V + (\sin\alpha\sin\beta)W & (\cos\alpha\sin\beta)V - (\sin\alpha\cos\beta)W \\ e^{i\gamma}(\sin\alpha\cos\beta)V - e^{i\gamma}(\cos\alpha\sin\beta)W & e^{i\gamma}(\sin\alpha\sin\beta)V + e^{i\gamma}(\cos\alpha\cos\beta)W \end{pmatrix}. \tag{87}$$

Let v and w be any two entries of the same position in V and W, respectively. Since Y is an order-six CHM we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |(\cos\alpha\cos\beta)v + (\sin\alpha\sin\beta)w| && (88)\\ = \ & |(\cos\alpha\sin\beta)v - (\sin\alpha\cos\beta)w| && (89)\\ = \ & |(\sin\alpha\cos\beta)v - (\cos\alpha\sin\beta)w| && (90)\\ = \ & |(\sin\alpha\sin\beta)v + (\cos\alpha\cos\beta)w| && (91)\\ = \ & \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}. && (92) \end{aligned}$$

The equality between (88), (89) and (92) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & |(\cos\alpha\cos\beta)v + (\sin\alpha\sin\beta)w|^2 + |(\cos\alpha\sin\beta)v - (\sin\alpha\cos\beta)w|^2 \\ = \ & (\cos\alpha)^2|v|^2 + (\sin\alpha)^2|w|^2 \\ = \ & 1/3, \end{aligned} \tag{93}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & |(\cos\alpha\cos\beta)v + (\sin\alpha\sin\beta)w|^2 - |(\cos\alpha\sin\beta)v - (\sin\alpha\cos\beta)w|^2 \\ = \ & ((\cos\alpha)^2|v|^2 - (\sin\alpha)^2|w|^2)\cos 2\beta + (\frac{vw^* + v^*w}{2})\sin 2\alpha \sin 2\beta \\ = \ & 0. \end{aligned} \tag{94}$$

The equality between (88) and (91), and the equality between (89) and (90) is equivalent to

$$(|v|^2 - |w|^2)\cos 2\alpha = (|v|^2 - |w|^2)\cos 2\beta = 0. \tag{95}$$

Then (93) and (95) imply (81). Next, (81) and (95) imply (82) and (83). Third, (81), (94) and (95) imply (80). By applying $vw^* + v^*w \geq -|v|^2 - |w|^2$ to (80) and (81), we obtain $\alpha + \beta \geq \pi/4$. Thus (79) is proved. Next, (79)-(83) imply (ii.a) and (ii.b).

(ii.c) Since $\alpha + \beta \geq \pi/4$ in (79), it suffices to exclude the equation $\alpha + \beta = \pi/4$. Suppose it holds. The case $\alpha\beta = 0$ has been excluded by Lemma 11 (vii). So we may assume that $\alpha\beta \neq 0$. It follows from (81)-(83) that

$|v_{jk}| = |w_{jk}| = 1/\sqrt{3}$. It follows from (80) that $v_{jk} = -w_{jk}$, and thus X has Schmidt rank one. It is a contradiction with the fact that X has Schmidt rank two. So $\alpha + \beta > \pi/4$.

(ii.d) Suppose $(\alpha, \beta) = (\pi/4, \pi/4)$. Assertion (ii.b) implies that $v_{jk}^* w_{jk} + v_{jk} w_{jk}^* = 0$. Then $v_{jk} = i p_{jk} w_{jk}$ where $p_{jk} = 1$ or -1 for any j, k. Assertion (ii.b) also implies that $|v_{jk}|^2 + |w_{jk}|^2 = 2/3$. Since V and W are both unitary, each of them contains at most one zero entry in the same position of them. We have

$$V = D_1 \cdot \left[i \begin{pmatrix} w_{11} & w_{12} & w_{13} \\ w_{21} & q_{22} w_{22} & q_{23} w_{23} \\ w_{31} & q_{32} w_{32} & q_{33} w_{33} \end{pmatrix} \right] \cdot D_2, \tag{96}$$

where D_1 and D_2 are diagonal real unitary matrices, and $q_{jk} = \pm 1$. It follows from Lemma 6 (ii) that $V = i D_1' W D_2'$ where D_1' and D_2' are diagonal real unitary matrices. It follows from Lemma 11 (vii) that $\mathbb{H}_2(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, V, W)$ is not a member of MUB trio.

It remains to prove the assertion when $(\alpha, \beta) \neq (\pi/4, \pi/4)$. Suppose $\mathbb{H}_2(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, V, W)$ is a member of MUB trio. Since $(\alpha, \beta) \neq (\pi/4, \pi/4)$, assertion (ii.a) implies that V and W are both CHMs. Lemma 7 (i) implies that $V = D_1 X D_2$ and $W = D_3 Y D_4$, where $D_1, \cdots, , D_4$ are all diagonal unitaries, X and Y are $\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \omega & \omega^2 \\ 1 & \omega^2 & \omega \end{pmatrix}$ and $\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \omega^2 & \omega \\ 1 & \omega & \omega^2 \end{pmatrix}$. Further $X \neq Y$ follows from Lemma 11 (vii). Hence $\mathbb{H}_2(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, V, W)$ is locally equivalent to the CHM $\mathbb{H}_2(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, V', W')$ where $V' = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \omega & \omega^2 \\ 1 & \omega^2 & \omega \end{pmatrix}$, $W' = \mathrm{diag}(e^{i\gamma_1}, e^{i\gamma_2}, e^{i\gamma_3}) \cdot \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \omega^2 & \omega \\ 1 & \omega & \omega^2 \end{pmatrix} \right] \cdot \mathrm{diag}(1, e^{i\delta_2}, e^{i\delta_3})$ and $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \delta_2, \delta_3 \in [0, 2\pi)$. Applying (80) to $\mathbb{H}_2(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, V', W')$, we obtain that the nine real numbers

$$\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_1 + \delta_2, \gamma_2 + \delta_2 + 2\pi/3, \gamma_3 + \delta_2 + 4\pi/3, \gamma_1 + \delta_3, \gamma_2 + \delta_3 + 4\pi/3, \gamma_3 + \delta_3 + 2\pi/3 \tag{97}$$

are equal to $2m\pi \pm \arccos(-\frac{1}{3} \cot 2\alpha \cot 2\beta)$ with integers m. So two of $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$ are the same.

It follows from (97) that two of $\gamma_1 + \delta_2, \gamma_2 + \delta_2 + 2\pi/3, \gamma_3 + \delta_2 + 4\pi/3$ has difference $2\pi/3$ or $4\pi/3$. Hence

$$2\pi/3 = 2n\pi \pm 2 \arccos(-\frac{1}{3} \cot 2\alpha \cot 2\beta) \tag{98}$$

for some integer n and one of the two signs $\pm$ holds. On the other hand Eq. (79) and assertion (ii.c) imply that $\cot 2\alpha \cot 2\beta \in [0, 1]$. Hence $\arccos(-\frac{1}{3} \cot 2\alpha \cot 2\beta) \in [\pi/2, \arccos(-\frac{1}{3})]$ where $\arccos(-\frac{1}{3}) \approx 1.91$. So (98) does not hold. We have proved that $\mathbb{H}_2(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, V, W)$ is not a member of MUB trio.

(iii) Suppose U is a Schmidt-rank-three order-six CHM. It is known that U is a controlled unitary from the B side [8]. We have $U = \sum_{j=1}^{3} (I_2 \otimes V)(U_j \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|)(I_2 \otimes W)$ for some order-three unitary matrices V and W and some order-two unitary matrices U_j. By absorbing the phases of the first entries of the U_j's into V, we may assume that these entries are $\cos \alpha_j$, $\alpha_j \in [0, \pi/2]$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$. The unitarity of U_j then gives rise to the expression of $\mathbb{H}_3(\alpha_1, \beta_1, \gamma_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2, \gamma_2, \alpha_3, \beta_3, \gamma_3, V, W)$ in the assertion.

It remains to prove the assertion that we can make the first column vector of W consist of nonnegative and real elements. Let the vector be $(ae^{ib}, ce^{id}, fe^{ig})^T$ where $a, c, f \geq 0$ and b, d, g are real. Since the matrix $I_2 \otimes \mathrm{diag}(e^{ib}, e^{id}, e^{ig})$ commutes with the middle matrix of (84), we can replace V by $V \cdot \mathrm{diag}(e^{ib}, e^{id}, e^{ig})$. So the assertion holds.

(iii.a) Suppose one of $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ is equal to 0 or $\pi/2$. Then one of the four order-three submatrices forming the matrix $\mathbb{H}_3 := \mathbb{H}_3(\alpha_1, \beta_1, \gamma_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2, \gamma_2, \alpha_3, \beta_3, \gamma_3, V, W)$ in (84) is singular. So the matrix cannot be a member of any MUB trio by the matrix Y_5 in Lemma 11 (vii). It gives us a contradiction and thus none of $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ is not equal to 0 and $\pi/2$.

This completes the proof. ■

For more examples of equivalent matrices we refer the readers to [7]. We point out that the unitary matrices V and W in case (ii.b) may be not CHMs. Besides, the order-six CHM in (ii.b) can be written as $\begin{pmatrix} S & T \\ T & S \end{pmatrix}$ where S and T are order-three matrices and may be not proportional to unitary matrices. An example for the above two statements is the so-called Bjorck's circulant matrix, see [3, Eq. (A2)]. On the other hand, Eqs. (79)-(83) guarantee that the matrix in (78) is an order-six CHM of Schmidt rank two. Now we are in a position to prove Theorem 3.

Proof. Any MUB trio contains no matrix of Schmidt rank one because of Lemma 11 (vi) and Lemma 12 (i). Any MUB trio contains no matrix of Schmidt rank two because of Lemma 12 (ii) and (ii.d). This completes the proof. ■

From Theorem 3 and Definition 4, we obtain

Corollary 13. *If a set of four MUBs in $\mathbb{C}^6$ contains the identity, then any other MUB in the set has min-Schmidt rank at least three.*

D. Numerical Studies

By using a numerical search method proposed in [23], we have found 90 normalized and dephased vectors that are approximately unbiased to the column vectors of both the identity matrix I_6 and the spectral matrix in Eq. (6). It confirms the results in [3, 23]. The result of 90 exactly unbiased vectors is a rigorous result of [3]. The method of [23] alone cannot rigorously imply the same result. The same numerical method is also in [28]. By calculating the inner products among the 90 approximate vectors, we obtain the following result and confirm a result in [4].

Proposition 14. *Assume that the following two conditions hold:*
(i) The spectral matrix S in Eq. (6) *satisfies that $N_v(S) = 90$;*
(ii) The method in [23], when applied to the spectral matrix, indeed gives solutions that approximates the exact solutions to an accuracy defined as $|\langle\phi|\psi\rangle| < 0.01$, where $|\phi\rangle$ and $|\psi\rangle$ are the exact state and the approximate state, respectively. Then, no two of the 90 exact vectors are orthogonal to each other, thus there are no two normalized and mutually orthogonal vectors in $\mathbb{C}^6$ that are unbiased to the column vectors of both I_6 and the spectral matrix.

Proof. We obtained the numerical approximations of the 90 vectors using the method in [23], and further calculated the inner product between all pairs of these approximate vectors. The absolute value of the inner product is always greater than 0.1. Thus the assertion follows by considering the effect of approximations. ■

The conclusion of Prop. 14 is stated in [4], which uses semidefinite programming to reach the conclusion. We believe the values of the modulus of the inner products are of some interest, since they can be compared with the corresponding values for other order-six CHMs, and reflect some properties of the CHM.

The method of numerical search in [23] is not proven to be rigorous, but the result confirms that in [3]. It may be possible to make the result of Prop. 14 unconditional by extending the numerical effort based on the search in [23], but some difficulty is as follows: when the inner product of two vectors is near zero, the deviation from unbiased status of both vectors (with respect to a given order-six CHM such as the spectral matrix in Eq. (6)) may be very small. On the other hand, the method of [3] escapes this difficulty by solving some polynomial equations, thus it does not care about the case that the deviation from unbiased status is small but nonzero.

The method of numerical search in [23] shares some similarity to that for finding the Sinkhorn normal form of a unitary matrix in [29], but they are still quite different. In fact the two methods can be viewed as dual to each other in some sense: the former performs iterations on the vector while the latter does so on the matrix.

Lemma 7(x) has shown that the spectral matrix has min-Schmidt rank at most three. Numerical search suggests that the spectral matrix has min-Schmidt rank exactly three.

Numerical evidence suggests that there are many H_2-reducible CHMs that do not contain an order-three subunitary submatrix. We have tested the random instances among the two special classes of CHMs in [15, Sec. 6], and found that they always do not contain an order-three subunitary submatrix. There is at least one counterexample, e.g. the case $z = 1$ in the latter class. The reason this is of interest is that if an order-six CHM contains an order-three subunitary submatrix, then it cannot appear in any MUB trio in terms of Y_1 in Lemma 11 (vii).

IV. OPEN PROBLEMS

Two main problems arise from this paper. First, what if we replace the identity matrix in Theorem 2 with some other matrix? Can we still obtain the same conclusion? Second, can we show that no Schmidt-rank-three CHM can be a member of some MUB trio? It would improve Theorem 3. Investigating the two problems would further improve our understanding towards the existence of four MUBs in $\mathbb{C}^6$. We shall also study Conjecture 9. Related to the second question above, a possible topic for future study is the min-Schmidt rank of CHMs, which requires studying the CHMs up to equivalence.

Acknowledgments

L.C. was supported by the NSF of China (Grant No. 11501024), and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (Grant Nos. 30426401, 30458601 and 29816133). L.Y. was partially supported by NICT-A (Japan).

[1] J. Schwinger, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America **46**, pp. 570 (1960), ISSN 00278424, URL http://www.jstor.org/stable/70873.
[2] S. Brierley and S. Weigert, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 042312 (2008), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.78.042312.
[3] S. Brierley and S. Weigert, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 052316 (2009), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.79.052316.
[4] S. Brierley and S. Weigert, Journal of Physics: Conference Series **254**, 012008 (2010), ISSN 1742-6596, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/254/1/012008.
[5] A. S. Maxwell and S. Brierley, Linear Algebra and its Applications **466**, 296 (2015), ISSN 0024-3795, URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0024379514006867.
[6] D. McNulty and S. Weigert, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical **45**, 102001 (2012), URL http://stacks.iop.org/1751-8121/45/i=10/a=102001.
[7] S. Brierley, *Mutually Unbiased Bases in Low Dimensions*, PhD thesis, University of York, Department of Mathematics (2009).
[8] L. Chen and L. Yu, Phys. Rev. A **89**, 062326 (2014), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.89.062326.
[9] S. M. Cohen and L. Yu, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 022329 (2013), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.87.022329.
[10] L. Chen and L. Yu, Annals of Physics **351**, 682 (2014), ISSN 0003-4916, URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0003491614002863.
[11] L. Chen and L. Yu, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 042331 (2016), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.93.042331.
[12] M. A. Nielsen, C. M. Dawson, J. L. Dodd, A. Gilchrist, D. Mortimer, T. J. Osborne, M. J. Bremner, A. W. Harrow, and A. Hines, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 052301 (2003), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.67.052301.
[13] J. Tyson, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **36**, 10101 (2003).
[14] M. Wiesniak, T. Paterek, and A. Zeilinger, New Journal of Physics **13**, 053047 (2011), URL http://stacks.iop.org/1367-2630/13/i=5/a=053047.
[15] B. R. Karlsson, Linear Algebra and its Applications **434**, 247 (2011), ISSN 0024-3795, URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0024379510004283.
[16] T. Tao, Math. Res. Lett. **11**, 251 (2004).
[17] M. Idel, ArXiv e-prints (2016), 1609.06349.
[18] F. Szöllösi, Journal of the London Mathematical Society **85**, 616 (2012), URL http://jlms.oxfordjournals.org/content/85/3/616.abstract.
[19] L. Chen and D. Z. Djokovic, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 062332 (2012), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.86.062332.
[20] L. Chen and D. Z. Djokovic, ArXiv e-prints (2016), 1606.06254.
[21] L. Chen and L. Yu, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 032308 (2015), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.91.032308.
[22] T. Durt, B.-G. Englert, I. Bengtsson, and K. Zyczkowski, ArXiv e-prints (2010), 1004.3348.
[23] D. Goyeneche, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical **46**, 105301 (2013), URL http://stacks.iop.org/1751-8121/46/i=10/a=105301.
[24] D. McNulty and S. Weigert, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical **45**, 135307 (2012), URL http://stacks.iop.org/1751-8121/45/i=13/a=135307.
[25] D. McNulty, B. Pammer, and S. Weigert, Journal of Mathematical Physics **57**, 032202 (2016), URL http://scitation.aip.org/content/aip/journal/jmp/57/3/10.1063/1.4943301.
[26] K. Beauchamp and R. Nicoara, Linear Algebra and its Applications **428**, 1833 (2008), ISSN 0024-3795, URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S002437950700482X.
[27] P. Jaming, M. Matolcsi, P. Mra, F. Szllsi, and M. Weiner, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical **42**, 245305 (2009), URL http://stacks.iop.org/1751-8121/42/i=24/a=245305.
[28] H. Führ and Z. Rzeszotnik, Linear Algebra and its Applications **484**, 86 (2015), ISSN 0024-3795, URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0024379515003729.
[29] A. D. Vos and S. D. Baerdemacker, Open Systems and Information Dynamics **21**, 1450013 (2014), http://www.worldscientific.com/doi/pdf/10.1142/S1230161214500139, URL http://www.worldscientific.com/doi/abs/10.1142/S1230161214500139.